

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Criminal Justice System Project Final Report of Evaluation Findings: Critical Components for Successful Criminal Justice System Planning, January 2001

Author(s): Steven Weller Ph.D. ; John A. Martin Ph.D. ; David A. Price Ph.D. ; Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey Ph.D.

Document No.: 189031

Date Received: 08/03/2001

Award Number: 97-IJ-CX-0056

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PROJECT
FINAL REPORT OF EVALUATION FINDINGS:
CRITICAL COMPONENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PLANNING**

May 23, 2001

Submitted to:

National Institute of Justice
Office of Research and Evaluation
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20531

Submitted by:

Policy Studies Inc.
999 18th Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80202

Authors

Steven Weller, J.D., Ph.D.
John A. Martin, Ph.D.
David A. Price, Ph.D.
Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey, Ph.D.

This project was supported under award number 97-IJ-CX-0056 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary: Critical Components for Justice System Planning

Overview of the Criminal Justice System Project.....	i
Description of the Evaluation.....	iii
Critical Elements for Collaborative Justice System Planning.....	v
Recommendations For the Site Selection Phase	v
Recommendations For the Formation of the Policy Team.....	vii
Recommendations For Start-Up Activities.....	viii
Recommendations For the Information Gathering Phase	x
Recommendations For the Planning Phase.....	xii
Recommendations For Maintaining Momentum.....	xiii
Recommendations For Creating the Capacity to Implement Change	xiv

Section I: Purpose & Background

Introduction	1
Background to the Criminal Justice System Project.....	3
Background Characteristics.....	4
Organization of the CJSP	7
Description of the Sites.....	9
Elements of the CJSP	24
Phases of the CJSP	27
Sequencing of Events in the CJSP	29
Organization of the Report.....	32

Section II: Evaluation Methods

Introduction.....	34
Purposes of the Evaluation.....	34
Research Issues and Questions	35
Document The Project Environments	36
Identify Research Issues.....	37
Track Progress in Achieving CJSP Goals & Identify Potential Obstacles.....	37
Assess the Merits and Limitations of the CJSP Process.....	38
Assess the Prospects for Transferring and/or Adapting the Process to Other Jurisdictions	39
Outcomes and Measures.....	40
Process Measures	40

Intermediate Outputs	41
Project Outcomes	41
Process Measures	43
Leadership Practices	43
Collaboration Practices.....	46
Communication Practices	48
System-Wide Approach	49
Assessment Process	50
Visioning and Strategic Planning Process	51
Implementation, Monitoring and Change Management Process.....	52
Stakeholder/Community Involvement, Education and Outreach Processes.....	55
Intermediate Outputs	56
Information/Data and Assessment Tools to	
Understand Current Practices/System.....	56
Components of a Strategic Plan	57
Project Outcomes	57
Data Needs and Sources	58
How Data are Analyzed and Presented	61

Section III: Achievements of the Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP)

Introduction	63
Overview of Site Achievements.....	63
Developing Inter-Agency Collaboration as a Way of Doing Business	63
Developing Capacity to Create Policy Based on Data and Information.....	64
Creating System-Wide Approaches to Solving Problems.....	65
Developing Better Uses of Jail and Alternative Sanctions to Incarceration	66
Involving the Community in Criminal Justice Policy	67
Site Achievements.....	67
Jackson County.....	67
Tulsa County.....	72
Portage County.....	75
Wood County	77
Dutchess County	77
St. Lawrence County.....	79
State of Alaska	81
Maricopa County	82

Section IV: Factors for a Successful Collaborative Process

Introduction	84
A Policy Team Prepared to Work Together with a Clear Project Plan	84

Effective Task and Leadership Process.....	93
Sources of Formal and Informal Leadership.....	95
Sources of Task Leadership.....	96
Sources of Process Leadership.....	97
The Need for Task Leadership.....	100
The Need for Process Leadership.....	100
The Need for Local Leadership.....	102
Effects of Changes in Leadership.....	102
A Clear Sense of Progress and Accomplishment.....	103
Time Availability of Good Information.....	109
The Offender Population Data.....	110
The Assessment.....	111
Completion of Written Assessment Report and Presentation of Results at Retreat.....	114
Presentation Results Without Written Report.....	115
Building Local Capacity and Support.....	118
Building Support.....	121

Section V: Critical Elements for Successful Justice System Planning

Introduction.....	124
Site Selection Phase.....	124
Start-Up Phase.....	128
Formation of the Policy Team.....	128
Start-Up Activities.....	130
Information Gathering Phase.....	135
Planning Phase.....	138
Implementation of Changes Phase.....	140
Maintaining Momentum.....	141
Creating Capacity to Implement Change.....	143
Endnotes.....	147

Appendix A: Collaborative Survey Findings

Appendix B: Author Biographies

Appendix C: Evaluation Contacts

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CRITICAL COMPONENTS FOR JUSTICE SYSTEM PLANNING

This executive summary presents the findings from a three-year evaluation conducted by Policy Studies Inc. of a national demonstration project titled the Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP). The project was sponsored and supported by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and the Corrections Program Office (CPO) to create better criminal sanctioning policy.

Overview of the Criminal Justice System Project

January 1997, NIC began a three-year Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP). This project emerged from an Institute-wide strategic planning process where the top priority program goal was to develop an effective system of correctional sanctions. The CJSP was developed to address the system-wide sanctioning needs within the jurisdictions participating in the project, using facilitated local planning teams supported by information from a comprehensive system assessment. The decision-making body for the CJSP in each of the project sites was a local policy team composed of representatives from all of the criminal justice agencies in the jurisdiction and, in some sites, citizen members. To help the sites organize themselves to be successful, the CJSP assigned each site an outside consultant who served as a site coordinator. The site coordinators conducted from 3-5 visits to their sites

each project year. In addition, two consultants worked with the project to provide assistance to the sites in collecting and analyzing jail population data. The CJSP approach consisted of two elements: a system assessment and a system-wide collaborative planning effort. The system assessment was designed to gather the following information:

- An inventory of sanctions and programs available in each site's criminal justice system;
- Profiles of the criminal justice agencies in the site;
- An inventory of community resources to provide assistance to offenders;
- A process map of the criminal justice system;
- An analysis of the offender population, from jail data and court record data; and
- An analysis of the criminal justice issues in the site.

The second element of the CJSP was a collaborative planning effort to develop an integrated, coordinated system of correctional sanctions and programs. Specifically, the planning in each site was expected to result in:

- A statement of the mission of the criminal justice system;
- A vision of where the criminal justice system ought to be moving in the future;
- Agreement on issues/problems within the current criminal justice system;

-
- Identification of the policy team's long term goals and objectives for the criminal justice system; and
 - An action agenda for immediate next steps.

The CJSP approach was originally designed so that the assessment phase preceded the planning phase. In practice, however, no two sites followed the same progression of events, and work on the two elements proceeded simultaneously.

Description of the Evaluation

The principal objective of our evaluation was to assess the utility and effectiveness of the CJSP process in the demonstration sites. The evaluation examined a variety of process, intermediate output, and project outcome measures. In general, this included an assessment of:

- how the broad-based policy team was formed and developed;
- the activities and approach used to examine the existing criminal justice and correctional policy-making structure and sanctioning practices;
- the activities and approach used to develop a long range plan;
- the ability of each policy team to (1) work collaboratively; (2) use data about the sanctioning system to make improved policy decisions; (3) articulate a vision and shared goals for the criminal justice system; (4) develop new sanctioning options to meet policy goals; and (5) develop long term strategies for bringing about system-wide change; and

-
- the outcomes/results each site achieved.

The data we used to make the observations and findings were collected from multiple sources, including:

- Four or more site visits to each project site, during which PSI evaluation team members: (1) interviewed policy team members; (2) observed policy team meetings; (3) observed some of the assessment activities; (4) observed post-assessment policy team retreats; (5) observed post-retreat work group and policy team meetings; and (6) conducted debriefing meetings in each site approximately three and nine months after the end of the CJSP;
- A review of project documents from each site, including (1) the original application and supporting materials; (2) minutes of policy team meetings; (3) assessment reports; and (4) other documentation of site activities;
- Discussions with site coordinators by telephone, during site visits, and at site coordinators' meetings;
- Discussions with the lead local person in each of the sites by telephone and during site visits; and
- An analysis of the results of a survey on collaboration administered twice to all the policy team members in each site, first during the period from 14-20 months into the project and again approximately 30 months into the project.

Critical Elements for Collaborative Justice System Planning

This section discusses the critical elements for the collaborative justice system planning, based on the findings of the evaluation. It presents our recommendations for starting up and sustaining momentum in a project of the CJSP's scope and breadth. In the following discussion our recommendations are grouped into the following phases: (1) site selection; (2) formation of the policy team; (3) start-up; (4) information gathering; (5) planning; (6) maintaining momentum; and (7) creating the capacity to implement change.

Recommendations For the Site Selection Phase

Selecting the sites for a project such as the CJSP is a critical part of the project. If a site is to succeed in a project like the CJSP, the criminal justice leaders must have a clear perception of the need for the project, understand what will be expected of them, and be willing to commit the necessary resources to complete the work of the project. Below are recommendations for the site selection phase to assist NIC in evaluating the sites' readiness to engage in this type of work.

Recommendation 1. Describe the process and approach fully in the Request for Proposal. Describe the phases or elements of the process as well as some of the likely tasks or activities of the policy team. Define the

expectations of the sites and policy team members and lay out and discuss the inherent values of doing system-wide work.

Recommendation 2. Ask sites to explain in their applications why they believe they can be successful at working collaboratively to make system-wide improvements. Look for local conditions that will support their efforts, examples of successes in the past, or indications of the site's interest in learning a new approach to working together to make criminal justice system improvements.

Recommendation 3. Ask sites to clarify the authority (or anticipated authority) of the policy team in their jurisdiction. Determine if the policy team will be a decision-making or recommending body. Wherever possible, encourage the policy team to be officially sanctioned as the entity to make decisions for and improvements to the criminal justice system.

Recommendation 4. Ask sites to give examples of system-wide issues they would like to address through a project of this nature (rather than identifying *the* single problem they want to address). This is intended to keep sites open to identifying problems as part of the process rather than believing the problem is already defined, and thus, wanting to move immediately to finding solutions for their predetermined problem.

Recommendation 5. Ensure that the people who will be involved in the project perceive a need for the project and understand what will be expected of them.

Recommendations For the Formation of the Policy Team

It is important for a policy team in a project of this nature to be officially recognized and have the authority to make decisions for the criminal justice system. The membership, size and structure of the policy team are all critical issues that must be considered. Below are recommendations with regard to the formation of the policy team.

Recommendation 6. Assure that the policy team has the membership necessary to create effective, system-wide criminal justice policy, including all top criminal justice system agency heads, human service and treatment leaders, and other key decision makers such as county commissioners or county executives. In a statewide effort, the policy team might include representatives from the state legislative, executive and judicial branches.

Recommendation 7. Strongly encourage each site to seriously consider having a community member on the policy team. NIC should help policy teams weigh the benefits and drawbacks to having community members involved on the policy teams and should help them make the best decision for their jurisdiction. If community members are included on the policy team, develop a plan for integrating them into the policy team and educating them about the justice system.

Recommendation 8. Clarify the decision making authority of the policy team. If the policy team is a recommending body, assure that the policy team

involves people who are in a decision making role or who can significantly influence those who will be making the decisions.

Recommendation 9. Ensure that the policy team is a manageable size and/or structured in a manner that will help it work together effectively and achieve results. We recommend that the size of policy teams be between 8 and 15 people. If the size exceeds 15 people, we recommend the use of a structure such as subcommittees or work groups to do specific work.

Recommendations For Start-Up Activities

The beginning of a planning project such as the CJSP is a critical time. Initial project activities must be designed to assure that policy team members have: (1) a clear picture of the steps in the project and the expected interim and final outcomes of the project, (2) guidelines to govern how the policy team members will interact and make decisions, and (3) clear role definitions, including leadership. Below are recommendations with regard to the start-up activities of the CJSP.

Recommendation 10. Minimize the elapsed time between site selection and the start of the project. Seize early enthusiasm and momentum by starting up the projects within 4 to 6 weeks of selecting the sites.

Recommendation 11. Orient the formal and informal leaders of the policy team to the project. Explain the need to collaborate and think system-

wide, map out an approach that meets the needs and interests of the jurisdiction, and jointly customize the process to the jurisdiction.

Recommendation 12. Assure that the policy team leaders understand the need for both task and process leadership. Explain the importance of having both task and process leadership for an effective team. Provide leadership training as needed.

Recommendation 13. Orient all policy team members to the project early on, including (a) ensuring that they have a clear understanding of what they will be doing and the outcomes they are striving for and (b) ensuring that they are committed to the process and approach as described. Explain the approach, the process, what it will take to succeed at this type of work, the likely benefits to be gained, and what is expected of everyone and the site. Establish agreed upon ground rules for working together, agree on a meeting and project schedule, and identify expected project outcomes, goals, and mid-term milestones early in the project. Train everyone on collaboration principles and practices.

Recommendation 14. Teach members of the policy teams about collaboration and systems thinking. Teach members of the policy teams about the importance of taking a system-wide view of problems, to take into account how the actions of one agency can affect the work of other agencies. Assure that they understand how collaboration goes beyond cooperation, communication and coordination.

Recommendation 15. Assess the support needs of the policy teams up front and ensure that they have the professional and administrative staff support and resources needed to coordinate project activities. For example, as needed assign a person to support the policy team and determine what other professional assistance the team is in need of. Clearly define the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the professional and administrative staff.

Recommendation 16. Define the roles and responsibilities of key people involved in the project. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the site coordinator, the local site contact person, and the formal leader of the policy team. Take steps to ensure that each policy team receives a consistent and adequate level of support to complete its work.

Recommendation 17. Assure an adequate level of presence by the site coordinator to provide effective facilitation for the policy team. At least during the first year of the project, substantial outside facilitation is likely to be necessary, to help the policy teams conduct the assessment and develop a long term plan, and to educate the policy teams on collaborative planning.

Recommendations For the Information Gathering Phase

Promoting data-driven decision making was an important goal of the CJSP. An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the criminal justice system in each site is a critical part of the project. Below are recommendations for the information gathering phase of the CJSP.

Recommendation 18. Help sites develop a comprehensive data collection plan, including a matrix of data needs and data sources, before beginning the information and data gathering processes. Determine what information and data are needed to better understand the system, define what questions the policy team is attempting to answer, assess what data are available, and determine the best approach for gathering the information and data.

Recommendation 19. Provide sites with a generic blueprint and other helpful tools such as templates and methods for collecting and analyzing local information.

Recommendation 20. If outside consultants are needed, involve the teams actively in planning for and coordinating the activities of the external consultants. Gather the information systematically and synthesize the collective results and findings.

Recommendation 21. Share the information, data, and findings from all assessment activities soon after the activities are completed.

Recommendation 22. Present the assessment information, data, and findings in a written report or summary so that all policy team members have access to and see the same information. This helps all policy team members form a common understanding - or picture - of their criminal justice system.

Recommendation 23. Provide targeted technical assistance such as data and statistical assistance, team building, presentations on best practices, and

jail studies where there is a defined need. Take steps to ensure that the technical assistance provided is helpful to the site.

Recommendations For the Planning Phase

A major goal of the CJSP was to assist sites in developing a strategic plan setting forth a road map for making justice system improvements in the future. The outcome of the planning phase should be a written plan that describes the collective vision of the site, the strategic issues and the long range objectives, and action plans for the initial stapes to be taken to implement the plan. Below are recommendations for the planning phase of the CJSP.

Recommendation 24. Teach members of the policy teams about strategic planning, including the importance of strategic planning, the benefits to be gained, how to engage in a planning process, and how to develop a long range plan. Help policy teams understand the importance of collectively developing (a) agreed upon values for the criminal justice system; (b) a common long term vision for the system; (c) one to five year goals for the system; and (d) short and long term strategies for improving the system.

Recommendation 25. Encourage the members of the policy teams to focus on the long term strategic issues and strategies for addressing those issues, rather than just on short term problems.

Recommendation 26. Encourage teams to have a written document that summarizes their future direction, goals, and strategies.

Recommendation 27. Help the sites prepare to operationalize or implement their plan. Provide them with a variety of tools (e.g., action plans) and methods (e.g. implementation or action teams) for following through on their plans and for revising their plans at least annually. Help them establish first year priorities and complete action plans.

Recommendations For Maintaining Momentum

Maintaining momentum is likely to be a major challenge for an extensive project such as the CJSP. It is difficult to sustain a process and keep leaders engaged when the process is lengthy. There are some proven techniques we believe would be useful for the CJSP to embrace to create a high level of focus on, commitment to, and enthusiasm for the project. The policy teams need to set goals, establish performance measures, monitor progress and performance relative to the goals and measures, and celebrate successes. Then the policy teams must hold themselves responsible for achieving short and long range goals. Below are recommendations for maintaining momentum throughout the CJSP.

Recommendation 28. Maintain a reasonable pace of activities throughout the project. Avoid prolonged periods of inactivity.

Recommendation 29. Foster continuity from one meeting to the next by reminding policy team members of where they are in the process. In

particular, continually show them where they are in the process, both what they have accomplished to date and what is coming up.

Recommendation 30. Using the policy team's agreed-upon process and written plan, review the team's progress periodically and celebrate progress, the achievement of interim goals/milestones, and outcomes or accomplishments. Modify the process and the written plans as needed.

Recommendation 31. Hold periodic retreats away from the site, where policy team members can work together without the distractions of daily office pressures.

Recommendation 32. Periodically assess how well the team is working together, whether the team is doing meaningful and productive things, and whether it is accomplishing what it intended to accomplish. Take steps to improve in these areas if necessary.

Recommendations For Creating the Capacity to Implement Change

A critical issue for the CJSP is building the capacity for the site to continue the work of the policy team after the project ends and the facilitators leave. Learning how to ask the right questions and having tools for analyzing problems is critical for creating a sustainable capacity to continue the work of the policy team. Below are recommendations with regard to creating the capacity to implement change.

Recommendation 33. Provide sites with tools and methods to help them follow through with and monitor changes and improvements. The project should leave the sites with the capability to conduct their own data analysis and system assessments on a continuing basis, to provide feedback as to the successes of changes to the criminal justice system.

Recommendation 34. Provide the sites with the tools to maintain a collaborative climate. As new people take over leadership positions in the criminal justice system, there must be a method for integrating them into the collaborative methods of the policy team.

Recommendation 35. Communicate results to the community and stakeholders and build ongoing support for short and long term change and improvement efforts. Help sites document the changes they have made to their criminal justice system and the resulting impacts to the community.

We believe that the above approach to information-based, collaborative, system-wide policy making will provide an effective method for jurisdictions seeking to rethink sanctioning policies and develop a more comprehensive criminal justice system policy.

SECTION I

PURPOSE & BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

In January 1997, NIC began a three-year Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP), run under the direction of the Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP). This project emerged from a 1993 Institute-wide strategic planning process where the top priority program goal was to develop an effective system of correctional sanctions. This goal included addressing the system-wide sanctioning needs within jurisdictions.

The key values that emerged for the Criminal Justice System Project during NIC's planning process were:

In the light of these values, the goal of NIC's three-year CJSP was to:

... assist criminal justice policy makers and leaders in nine state and local jurisdictions develop more purposeful, cost effective and coordinated systems of correctional sanctions and programs.

In the fall of 1997, Policy Studies Inc. (PSI) was selected by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct a comprehensive implementation (or process) evaluation of the CJSP. The principal objective of the process evaluation was to assess the utility and effectiveness of the process used by the CJSP in the nine demonstration sites. Through examining a variety of process, intermediate outcome, and project outcome measures, the evaluation

focused on the steps and the approach the sites took to develop a more purposeful, cost-effective and coordinated system of correctional sanctions and programs. In general, the process evaluation included an assessment of:

- How the broad-based policy team (that includes all key leaders of the criminal justice system, community, service providers, businesses, legislators/county commissioners and other key stakeholders) was formed and developed
- The activities and approach used to examine existing criminal justice and correctional policy making structure and sanctioning practices;
- The activities and approach used to develop a strategic plan; and
- The ability of each policy team to (1) work collaboratively; (2) use actual data about the sanctioning system to make improved policy decisions; (3) articulate a vision and shared goals for the criminal justice system; (4) develop new sanctioning options to meet policy goals; and (5) develop long term strategies for bringing about system-wide change.

We expect the findings and recommendations from this evaluation will be useful to policy makers and leaders at all levels of the justice system (i.e., local, state, regional and federal) as they formulate new criminal justice and correctional sanctioning policies and seek to enhance policy making practices. In addition, the findings should provide a guide to creating more effective collaboration among criminal justice agencies, elected officials and the community.

BACKGROUND TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PROJECT

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) originally selected 9 sites to participate in the Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP). These sites were:

- The State of Alaska
- Arizona: Maricopa County
- California: Napa County
- Minnesota: Hennepin County
- New York: Dutchess and St. Lawrence Counties
- Oklahoma: Tulsa County
- Oregon: Jackson County
- Wisconsin: Wood and Portage Counties (as a joint site)

Despite a careful planning and site selection process, within the first nine months of the CJSP's three-year effort, two sites—Hennepin County, Minnesota and Napa County, California—withdraw from the project. The Maricopa County, Arizona site also withdrew after the project's assessment phase. Later into the project, the joint team from Wood and Portage Counties, Wisconsin, split into separate teams for each of the two counties. The reasons for these withdrawals and changes are discussed in later sections of this report.

Background Characteristics

Exhibit I-1 captures some basic demographic information about the CJSP sites. The statistics are the most recent available in each category and despite the differences in the years for each statistic, the data illustrate the diverse nature of the jurisdictions. For example:

- Population per square mile ranges from 1.1 person per square mile in Alaska to 961.9 persons per square mile in Tulsa County, Oklahoma.
- Per capita income in Tulsa County (the site with the highest per capita income) is about 1.6 times as great as in St. Lawrence County (the site with the lowest per capita income).
- Educationally, while the statistics on the proportion of high school graduates are reasonably similar across sites, the proportion of college graduates in Wood County is only about half the comparable proportion in Dutchess County.
- It was difficult to obtain comparable information about crime rates for individual CJSP sites and the statewide information displayed in the Table is likely to overstate or understate rates in individual counties. Yet, it is interesting to see that the highest rate (Arizona) is more than 2½ times the lowest rate (New York).

We chose to present crime data from a single source (Congressional Quarterly) to facilitate the comparison across sites. Unfortunately, this

required presenting statewide crime rates since individual county statistics were not available for all sites. As shown in Exhibit I-1, however, there are comparable data for four counties: Maricopa, Dutchess, St. Lawrence, and Jackson Counties. Crime rates for the two New York counties are marginally higher than for the state as a whole. For the other two CJSP sites, however, the crime rates for the county and state were quite disparate. Thus, in Jackson County, the 1996 crime rate (2,470 per 100,000 population) was less than half as much as the state rate, whereas in Maricopa County the rate (9,958 per 100,000 population) was substantially higher than the rate shown for the state.

Exhibit I-1
Demographic Profile of the CJSP Sites

CJSP Site	Size (square-miles) ¹	Population (1999) ¹	Per capita income (1998) ²	Education (1990) ¹	Unemployment rate (October, 2000) ³	Crime Rate (State/County 1996) ⁴
State of Alaska	570,374	619,500	\$27,835	86.6% H 23.0% C	4.2%	5.450 per 100,000 population
Maricopa County (Arizona)	9,204	2,861,395	\$27,254	81.5% H 22.1% C	2.6%	7,067 per 100,000 population (Arizona State) County = 9,958
Dutchess County (New York)	802	268,237	\$29,812	79.8% H 24.8% C	2.9%	2,746 per 100,000 population (New York State) county =
St. Lawrence County (New York)	2,686	112,853	\$18,148	73.1% H 15.1% C	6.9%	2,746 per 100,000 population (New York State) county =
Tulsa County (Oklahoma)	570	548,296	\$29,990	81.7% H 23.7% C	2.8%	5,653 per 100,000 population (Oklahoma State)
Jackson County (Oregon)	2,785	175,822	\$23,214	80.1% H 17.6% C	4.0%	5,997 per 100,000 population (Oregon State) County = 2,470
Portage County (Wisconsin)	806	65,022	\$22,452	79.7% H 19.1% C	2.3%	3,821 per 100,000 population (Wisconsin State)
Wood County (Wisconsin)	793	76,225	\$27,054	78.3% H 13.5% C	2.7%	3,821 per 100,000 population (Wisconsin State)

¹ Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *USA Counties*

² Source: http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/reis/ca1_3/

³ Source: Local Area Unemployment

Organization of the CJSP

The CJSP in each site involved the following players.

The Policy Team

The decision making body for the CJSP in each of the project sites was a local policy team composed of representatives from all of the criminal justice agencies in the jurisdiction and, in some sites, citizen members.

The Site Coordinators

To provide continuing assistance to the sites, the CJSP assigned each site a coordinator. The coordinator's role varied depending on the needs of the site. Among the functions the coordinator performed were (1) helping establish the policy team, (2) facilitating team meetings, (3) helping the policy teams focus the system assessment to meet their needs, (4) identifying the sites' other technical assistance and training needs; (5) coordinating the various components of the system assessment; (6) helping the policy team develop a vision for their criminal justice system; and (7) working with the policy team/strategic planning team to develop goals and strategies to achieve the vision. The site coordinators conducted from 3-5 visits to their sites each project year. Two of the site coordinators were CEPP staff and the others were consultants hired by CEPP.

The NIC Liaison

A liaison from the National Institute of Corrections was assigned to each site, to assist in facilitating site meetings, help identify technical assistance needs and locate sources of technical assistance where appropriate. Separate technical assistance funds were available for the sites through NIC.

The Data Consultants

Two consultants from Justice Research Associates, Inc. worked with the project to provide assistance to the sites in collecting and analyzing jail population data. Each consultant was assigned to half of the sites.

CEPP Staff

Oversight and coordination for the entire project was provided by the Center for Effective Public Policy. CEPP staff (1) collected project reports from the sites, (2) kept site coordinators informed of project activities in all the sites, (3) accompanied site coordinators on project site visits, (4) conducted periodic meetings of the site coordinators, NIC liaisons and data consultants (also attended by the evaluation team), and (5) managed project tasks and budget.

The Assessment Consultant ("Swoop") Teams

A consultant team was assembled for each site to conduct an in-depth assessment of the site's criminal justice system and its problems, through interviews with a wide variety of justice system and community representatives. Some interviewers were used for more than one site, and some went to only one site. The

consultant team for each site spent a week on-site conducting the interviews. This week-long visit by multiple interviewers came to be known as the "swoop".

Description of the Sites

The sites that participated in the CJSP were quite diverse. Although they participated in the same series of steps and applied the same basic approach to the project, they moved through the phases of the CJSP at different rates. Each site had different issues that they hoped to address through the CJSP. They also had policy teams of different size and membership and different levels of staffing for the project. All of these had important effects on the pace and achievements of the project in the different sites. The following is a description of the presenting problem, policy team composition and staffing in each of the project sites.

Alaska

Problem. Alaska's presenting problem was prison overcrowding and the lack of understanding within the criminal justice community that the problem cannot be solved by Department of Corrections (DOC) initiatives alone. Indeed, the options available to DOC to address prison overcrowding were fairly limited. The application sought assistance through the CJSP to help the State develop a broader, more comprehensive, and coordinated response to the overcrowding issue. The presenting problem had become more important at the time of the application due to declining state revenues from oil and the lack of legislative consensus about long term solutions. The application concluded that an outside assessment of the entire system would help the

stakeholders in the Alaska criminal justice system approach the problem from a broader perspective.

Policy Team. The Criminal Justice Assessment Commission (CJAC), Alaska's policy team, was assembled specifically for the CJSP and had a finite term through January 2000. The Commission's membership included key justice system leaders (both state and local), representatives from all three branches of government, and representatives from community services agencies and the community at large. The Commission was dynamic, and new people were added over the course of the project. For example, the State Court Administrator was added in early 1998, the director of the Department of Health and Social Services was added in summer 1998, and Commission members continued to discuss the need to include Native Alaskan representatives from the bush. State Attorney General and the former State Court Administrator co-chaired the Commission.

Staffing. Staff support for CJAC was provided by the Alaska Judicial Council and by a person assigned to assist the Director of the Department of Corrections (DOC). Judicial Council staff prepared agendas and meeting minutes. The DOC staff person assisted in data gathering and completing some of the intermediate outputs (e.g., agency profiles) for the assessment. The staff person was not formally assigned to provide support to CJAC, however, and as a result was frequently distracted by other job responsibilities. Since late 1998, the equivalent of a full-time staff person from the

Alaska Judicial Council was assigned to provide support to CJAC and the NIC/CEPP consultant team.

Maricopa County, Arizona

Problem. The presenting problem in Maricopa County was lack of effective case management in the criminal courts. The lack of effective case management was reflected in a backlog of cases and lengthy times from case filing to disposition, and greater workloads for staff. The problem was exacerbated by several factors outside the courts' control, including high population growth rates in Maricopa County and increased resources dedicated to law enforcement activities. A secondary issue of importance to the County at the time of the application was how to target adult offenders for services. The Adult Probation Department was eager to have an outside opinion about whether they were offering too many programs, whether the programs were effective, and how they could be better at giving offenders the best set of appropriate services.

Jail overcrowding, although as much an issue in Maricopa County as in other CJSP sites, was already being addressed through a jail facilities study. In fact, a conscious decision was made to delay the CJSP assessment phase until after the jail study report was released. In the opinion of a few policy team members, some momentum on the CJSP was lost because of that delay.

Policy Team. Officially, the policy team in Maricopa County was the Policy Group of the Maricopa County Justice Coordinating Committee (McJustice). McJustice

is a consortium of law enforcement and justice agencies of Maricopa County that was formed originally in 1989. Today, it is a forum that brings together the key leaders in the justice system (both the judicial and executive branches) and legislative representatives (County Board of Supervisors, Phoenix City Council) once a month to discuss problems in the system and identify appropriate solutions. The team size changed over the course of the assessment from 22 members to 29 members.

Key decisions about CJSP activities and direction were not made by the policy team, but by a smaller, executive committee of McJustice. It was their decision, for example, to withdraw from the CJSP after the assessment. In addition to McJustice, there was a work group of mid-level people who assumed responsibility for completing many of the CJSP components, such as the agency profiles.

Missing from the McJustice membership was any involvement from the community. Although aware of their absence, the McJustice leadership did not seek participation from the community throughout the time they participated in the CJSP.

Staffing. Staffing for the CJSP was provided by the Deputy Court Administrator and the Director of Adult Probation. They kept the policy team updated on CJSP activities and participated on the work group to ensure completion of the CJSP components.

Dutchess County, New York

Problem. Jail overcrowding was a key concern of Dutchess County in its application, and most of the goals the application identified for the project were related

to this issue. For example, the application sought to (1) align the correctional priorities and policies with prosecutorial priorities and policies; (2) make sanctioning policy more consistent, fair, and equitable; (3) explore options for cost containment that do not jeopardize public safety; and (4) learn how to use data more effectively. The county had spent several years dealing with jail overcrowding issues, including internal and external studies of how large a jail Dutchess County should build. A result of these studies was the creation of several alternative programs to deal with offenders, the creation of the Criminal Justice Council (CJC), and a recommended jail size. That jail overcrowding was still an issue by the time of the CJSP reflects the continued lack of consensus about the appropriate jail size.

Policy Team. Dutchess County had a policy team prior to the CJSP. The Criminal Justice Council (CJC) was established in 1993 by the County Legislature. The major issue facing the County at the time was whether to expand the jail by 100 beds (still an issue today). Since that time, the CJC has been a forum to discuss a wide range of other justice system issues (e.g., alternatives to incarceration, juvenile justice, day reporting, work alternatives). Given its prior work and its membership, which includes the key leaders from the local criminal justice system and community members, the CJC was a natural choice to be the policy team for the CJSP.

As an existing body, CJC did not have a problem of defining the leadership for the Council, which rotates every two years. Who would provide leadership for the CJSP, however, and how that would be integrated with other work of the Council was

an issue. That duty fell to the Director of Probation and Community Corrections, who also had taken the lead in preparing the original grant application for NIC. She assumed responsibility for promoting the CJSP agenda before the Council and ensuring completion of the various intermediate outputs. She also used her staff as administrative support for CJSP activities (e.g., preparing meeting minutes, materials for policy team members).

Staffing. Staffing for the CJC was problematic. The Director of the Department of Probation and Community Corrections was the liaison between the policy team and NIC/CEPP. Staff in the Department provided part-time support to the Council under the leadership of the Department Director. Yet, there was no one whose sole responsibility it was to oversee CJSP activities until late in the project when the policy team hired one of the citizen members on the team to provide support to the team and to work groups.

An important addition to the staffing for both Dutchess and St. Lawrence Counties was the support offered by New York State for the data collection effort. One staff person who worked jointly for the State Department of Probation and the Division of Criminal Justice Services, was made available full time to develop the data required by the project.

St. Lawrence County, New York

Problem. St. Lawrence County's application identified jail overcrowding as a key problem facing the county, but the application also noted the lack of an integrated

graduated sanctions approach and lack of long term planning within the criminal justice system. As it began its discussions, the policy team identified a further issue: the impact of the local magistrate courts on the jail population. Understanding that impact and learning to deal more effectively with the local magistrate courts was therefore viewed as a priority area for the policy team's deliberations.

Policy Team. Although the Criminal Justice Policy Group was newly formed for the CJSP, St. Lawrence County had a prior history of cooperation among justice system agencies. As recently as 1993, the County had a Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee that reportedly made progress in identifying and solving criminal justice system issues. The group disbanded in mid-1994, and no cross-agency planning effort had been initiated since that time.

The CJSP policy team was small—nine members—but included all the key policy makers in the county, including representatives from all the justice system agencies, Community Services, and county administrators. The relationship among these individuals was informal and relaxed, partly because they worked together on a daily basis and were located in close proximity to one another. There were no community members represented on the team. This omission reflects a conscious decision on the part of the team. The team believed that the county was small enough so that policy team members understood the public's concerns.

Staffing. There was no formal staff support to the policy team. Instead, the senior Probation Officer provided informal, part time support (e.g., meeting logistics,

meeting notices, etc.) to the team, and the Director of Community Corrections was instrumental in disseminating information and keeping policy team members active in the project. As noted for Dutchess County above, the State provided a full time staff person to develop the data for CJSP activities.

Tulsa County, Oklahoma

Problem. Jail overcrowding was identified as a key issue in the application to NIC. More broadly, however, the county was interested in how to (1) reduce the cost of incarceration, (2) protect the public, and (3) rehabilitate criminals. Sometime after the application, the policy team was faced with a new challenge through passage by the Oklahoma State Legislature of the Community Sentencing Act of 1997. That Act required each county in the state to create a county Community Sentencing Planning Council and develop a local community sentencing plan. The CJSP policy team became the Council. Many of the CJSP assessment activities (e.g. the "swoop") were delayed until the community sentencing plan was completed and delivered to the State Department of Corrections on February 1, 1998. Some problems emerged as the Council began its work to develop the community sentencing plan. For example, as part of the data collection effort, the Council gathered information on the jail population. The study revealed a very high illiteracy rate among the offenders, with the result that educational programs in the jail became another concern of the policy team.

Policy Team. Prior to the project, the county had a committee, which still exists, to study the jail overcrowding issues that were mentioned in the NIC application. Nevertheless, the county formed a special policy team for the CJSP, in large part to meet the requirements of the 1997 Community Sentencing Act. That Act required that each county in Oklahoma create a local planning council, with specified membership. The local planning council created under the Act was designated as the policy team for the CJSP. The team included many of the key stakeholders in the justice system, as well as representatives from the executive branch (e.g. Mayor of Tulsa) and the general public. The team was relatively small (14 people) and was chaired by the presiding judge of the district court. The team had several subcommittees that worked on various dimensions of the CJSP assessment (in addition to the community sentencing plan). For example, there was (1) an implementation subcommittee that prepared the caseflow map at the sanctioning end of the process, (2) a data subcommittee that developed the offender-sanction figures for the community sentencing plan, and (3) a program inventory subcommittee that identified and profiled service providers.

Staffing. A key feature of the CJSP policy team in Tulsa County was the staff support available to it. The team had one full time staff person whose services were provided through a regional planning agency that serves local governments in eastern Oklahoma. That staff person drafted all meeting agendas, gathered supplemental information for the meetings, drafted key project written products, and served as the liaison with the CEPP site coordinator and NIC. Minutes of the policy team meetings

were prepared by a representative from the State Department of Corrections, who attended the meetings as an observer.

Jackson County, Oregon

Problem. Jail overcrowding was a major issue in Jackson County's application. Although always a concern, it had moved to the forefront of justice system topics because of: (1) a federal consent decree with the county that capped the jail population, (2) changes in legislation that resulted in the placing of state community correction staff and the supervision of certain felony offenders under the county, and (3) the lack of objective criteria for releasing offenders from the jail to meet the cap. In addition to jail issues, the county criminal justice system was facing several challenges it needed assistance addressing. This included a need for (1) identifying uses of a new work release facility being built, (2) developing a plan to merge the state and county probation departments (and dealing with the resulting staffing issues), and (3) developing an approach for gathering and using data for better decision making.

Policy Team. In 1995, the Oregon State Legislature mandated the formation of Local Public Safety Coordinating Councils (LPSCC) in every county to advise county commissioners on local corrections options. The CJSP policy team for Jackson County was a subset of the LPSCC, called the adult subcommittee of the LPSCC. The Director of Community Corrections initially served as chair of the policy team. She retired in July of 1998. The new Director of Community Corrections then took over as chair of the policy team. He had been in charge of the state probation office in Jackson County

before the transfer of the office to the county and was well known and highly respected in the community. There is citizen participation on both the LPSCC and the adult subcommittee. One citizen member did not have prior experience with the criminal justice system and therefore required some education to participate fully in meeting discussions and decisions. All the citizen members, however, were interested and engaged and appeared to be good representatives of public concerns.

Staffing. The policy team had no formal staffing initially. In mid-1998, however, formal staff support was hired, paid for out of county funds.

Wood and Portage Counties, Wisconsin

Problem. The counties faced similar criminal justice system problems, but the presenting problem for both was the lack of jail space. They wished to collaborate jointly in designing and constructing a work release facility that would be shared by the two counties (both its costs and use), and they needed objective data for planning the facility.

Policy Team. Wood and Portage Counties assembled a joint policy team for the CJSP. As adjoining counties with similar demographics, they reportedly had cooperated well on addressing other issues of common interest, such as highway improvements and economic development projects. They viewed the CJSP as another opportunity to cooperate and thus maximize the use of scarce resources in addressing criminal justice sanctioning policies and constructing a work release facility the counties would share. The key justice system leaders from both counties were represented on

the team. In addition, there were representatives from the Boards of Supervisors in both counties. (There were also citizen members on the team initially, although they largely stopped attending meetings just prior to the first PSI site visit.) The joint team faced many challenges, however. One of the most important was that the team was never recognized by either of the County Boards as being an authoritative decision making body for justice system issues.

After the CJSP assessment, it became clear that neither county was ready to build a joint work release facility. The joint team could no longer find a common focus and was dissolved in early 1999. In its place, each county assembled its own policy team, which the respective County Boards recognized as the vehicle to address criminal justice system issues. Some issues, however, especially community education, were still addressed jointly.

Staffing. Staffing for the joint policy team was provided by the Board of Supervisors in Portage County. The staff person organized the meetings, prepared the agendas, served as the liaison between the team and NIC/CEPP, and was responsible for preparing the different assessment components. When the team split into two, the Portage County Board of Supervisors hired the staff person full time in the position of criminal justice planner.

Exhibit I-2 summarizes the initial presenting problems and objectives of the CJSP sites, as indicated in their grant applications.

EXHIBIT I-2
SUMMARY OF PRESENTING PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES BY SITE

Site	Presenting Problems	Objectives
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Non-release of pre-trial defendants ▶ Probation and parole violation holds ▶ Assignment of custody levels ▶ Alcohol holds ▶ Mentally ill prisoners who need treatment ▶ Decreasing use of discretionary parole ▶ Tendency toward longer sentences ▶ Investigation of alternative ways to manage offenders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reduce jail and prison overcrowding ▶ Improve collaboration among all actors in the criminal justice system • Determine the best uses of diversion, restorative justice and other alternative sanctions
Maricopa County (Arizona)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Growth in the offender population without growth in resources ▶ Lack of interpreter services ▶ Slow case processing • Inefficient flow of information between justice system agencies ▶ Shortage of community-based treatment resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve coordination between/among different levels of courts • Improve coordination among justice system agencies • Develop information systems compatible across agencies ▶ Define state vs. local responsibilities • Implement a collaborative strategic planning process • Increase community involvement
Dutchess County (New York)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Containing criminal justice costs • Setting priorities for the criminal justice system • Understanding the data that need to be collected ▶ Identifying and defining performance outcomes • Building a rational relationship between adult corrections and youth services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reach a series of shared goals and objectives • Define local sanctioning policy
St. Lawrence County (New York)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dealing with the many local justice courts • Assuring that the right people are in jail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make decisions based on facts and not perceptions ▶ Get policy makers to put aside turf issues and work toward common goals

EXHIBIT I-2 SUMMARY OF PRESENTING PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES BY SITE		
Site	Presenting Problems	Objectives
Tulsa County (Oklahoma)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 1997 Truth in Sentencing and Community Sentencing Acts ▶ Knowing which offenders will be in the community rather than in jail under new legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Develop a plan for community sentencing, as required by the 1997 Community Sentencing Act ▶ Develop programs and sanctions to meet offender and community needs
Jackson County (Oregon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jail overcrowding ▶ Use of a new jail facility • Handling felony offenders sentenced to one year or less, formerly held in state penitentiary • Combining state probation into the county probation department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Enhance cooperative agency working relationships ▶ Establish a process for planning and policy development to protect the public, reduce criminal activity and change offender behavior ▶ Provide the opportunity for citizen participation • Increase skills in analyzing data
Wood & Portage Counties (Wisconsin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of data about the criminal justice system • Assessing offenders prior to sentencing ▶ Handling probation violation holds ▶ Use of alternative sentencing options • Offender classification for incarceration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Make decisions based on data • Create cooperative decision-making between the two counties ▶ Develop an effective and cost-efficient justice system ▶ Determine what new jail facility to build

Exhibit I-3 summarizes the key elements of the organization of the policy teams in each of the CJSP sites. The key justice system leaders serving on the county level policy teams typically included some combination of judges, the court administrator, the sheriff, the chief of police of the largest city in the county, the jail administrator, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, the head of probation, the community corrections director, and the director of pretrial release.

**EXHIBIT I-3
KEY ELEMENTS OF PROJECT ORGANIZATION**

CJSP Site	Lead Agency	Policy Team (size)	Policy Team Composition	Policy Team Chair
State of Alaska	Department of Corrections	Criminal Justice Assessment Commission (27) (New)	judges, court administration, law enforcement, corrections, probation/parole, prosecution, defense, community service agencies, state legislators, citizen members	Attorney General/State Court Administrator (retired)
Maricopa County (Arizona)	Probation Department & Superior Court	Policy Group for McJustice (22)	key justice system leaders, City Council, County Board of Supervisors	Judge
Dutchess County (New York)	Probation & Community Corrections (also State)	Criminal Justice Council (28)	key justice system leaders, County Executive, service agency representative, citizen members	County legislator
St. Lawrence County (New York)	Probation Department (also State)	Criminal Justice Policy Group (9) (New)	key justice system leaders, county administrator, community service agencies	Director, Probation Department
Tulsa County (Oklahoma)	County Commissioner & Sheriff	Community Sentencing Planning Council (14) (New)	key justice system leaders, County Commissioner, Mayor of Tulsa, citizen members	Judge
Jackson County (Oregon)	Community Corrections	Adult Subcommittee of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (14)	key justice system leaders, County Executive, citizen members	Director of Community Corrections; Judge
Wood and Portage Counties (Wisconsin)	County Planning Offices	Criminal Justice System Assessment Policy Team (16)	key justice system leaders, county commissioners, citizen members	Judge

Elements of the CJSP

The CJSP consisted of two basic elements, a system assessment and a strategic planning element. Each is described below.

System Assessment

- The first element of the CJSP was an assessment of the jurisdiction's criminal justice system. The system assessment was designed to gather the following components of information:
- An inventory of sanctions and programs available in the criminal justice system in the site;
- Profiles of the criminal justice agencies in the site;
- An inventory of community resources to provide assistance to offenders;
- A process map of the criminal justice system;
- An analysis of the offender population, from jail data and court record data; and
- An analysis of the criminal justice issues in the site.

The first four items were to be collected by the policy team, either as a group or through workgroups or individual assignments, with guidance from the site coordinator. The CEPP staff provided templates to guide the agency profiles, community resource inventory, and sanctions and programs inventory. The process map, which consisted of a flowchart of the steps in the criminal justice process, was prepared by the policy team, with the assistance of the site coordinator in some sites, and with justice system staff providing details as needed.

The analysis of the offender population was conducted by the data consultants, with the assistance of the management information system staff in each site. Depending on the site, some data were available from jail or court automated data records and some data had to be collected by hand. In some sites, the data on offenders were partly in one system (e.g. the jail) and partly in another (e.g. the court or social services). In those sites, the data from different sources had to be merged, which included reconciling different data formats.

The analysis of criminal justice issues in each site was conducted by a team of 4-6 external consultants who visited the site and interviewed a wide range of individuals both within and outside the justice system. The consultants typically all came during one week and fanned out throughout the community conducting interviews. The site coordinator was responsible for selecting whom to interview (in conjunction with the policy team), arranging the interviews, preparing questions for each interview, and coordinating the different consultants to assure that all the necessary information was collected. As noted earlier, this one-week multi-person site visit came to be called the "swoop." Different swoop teams were used for each site. In some sites the swoop team produced a written assessment report, while in other sites the findings of the assessment were presented to the policy team orally and/or in the form of short summary papers on selected topics.

The approach to the CJSP assessment emphasized a considerable amount of information gathering prior to the intensive on-site work by the assessment team. Thus,

the sites prepared inventories of their sanctioning options and programs and community resources and examined how cases progress through the system by developing caseflow maps before the swoops took place. This up-front activity was designed to give the on-site assessment team a better understanding of the jurisdiction before it conducted its assessment visits.

Strategic Planning

The second element of the CJSP was strategic planning to help the policy team develop a long term plan for making system-wide improvements to its correctional sanctions and programs. Specifically, the planning in each site was expected to result in:

- A statement of the mission of the criminal justice system;
- An agreed upon vision of where the criminal justice system ought to be moving in the future;
- Agreement on issues/problems and short and long term priorities within the current criminal justice system;
- Identification of the policy team's goals and objectives for the criminal justice system; and
- An action agenda for immediate next steps.

This element also recognized the importance of having the right policy team to address the issues of importance to the jurisdiction. Thus, one of the activities involved working with the existing team to determine the right composition for a strategic

planning team.

Phases of the CJSP

The CJSP may be viewed as divided into five phases: (1) the site selection phase; (2) the start-up phase; (3) the information gathering phase; (4) the planning phase; and (5) the implementation of changes phase.

Site Selection Phase

NIC was careful in its selection process to identify sites that were committed to improving their system of correctional sanctions and that were willing to be a partner with NIC in this ambitious effort. To ensure this commitment, they required sites to identify a pressing problem facing the criminal justice system and demonstrate the cooperation and commitment of all key justice system leaders by providing letters of support for the project. NIC viewed its primary role as providing (1) technical expertise, (2) facilitation skills, and (3) research assistance (primarily for data analysis). It expected the sites to contribute (1) the time, talents and energy of key leaders in the criminal justice system and community, (2) staff resources, and (3) some funding support.

Start-Up Phase

Once the sites were selected, the initial activities of the CJSP were aimed at putting a structure in place to allow the project to succeed. This included establishing: (1) the authority of the policy team, (2) proper membership and commitment of the policy team; (3) adequate resources for the policy team, and (4) a climate to enable

collaboration. The ability to establish this structure varied from site to site and affected the ability of the sites to maintain momentum as the project progressed. Initial project activities must be designed to assure that policy team members have: (1) a clear picture of the steps in the project and the expected interim and final outcomes of the project, (2) guidelines to govern how the policy team members will interact and make decisions, (3) adequate resources for the policy team; (4) clear role definitions, including leadership, and (5) effective facilitation.

Information Gathering Phase

A major goal of the CJSP was to assist sites in making policy decisions based on data and information about the strengths and weaknesses of the criminal justice system in the site. The data collection and analysis and the system assessment were the two most difficult elements of the CJSP. A critical goal of this phase was to assure that the policy teams understood all of the facets of the information gathering phase and how the various assessment tools and information would come together to help the policy team in developing criminal justice policy.

Planning Phase

Having a vision for the criminal justice system provides a desired future toward which to strive. Having a collective vision assures that everyone on the team is striving toward the same desired future. Considering the mission and vision early is important, as the mission and vision can affect the desired composition of the policy team. As with a mission and vision, identifying strategic issues early in the assessment process is

important so that the policy team begins thinking about long term issues rather than just focusing on and being trapped by the most immediate problems occupying people's attention.

Implementation of Changes Phase

The implementation of changes phase of the project encompassed: (1) maintaining momentum and (2) creating the capacity to implement change. Maintaining momentum was a major challenge for the CJSP sites. It is difficult to sustain a process and keep leaders engaged when the process is lengthy. Building the capacity for the site to continue the work of the policy team after the project ends and the facilitators leave is the ultimate indicator of the success of the project. Building this capacity includes both: (1) providing the sites with tools to create change and (2) creating support for change in terms of developing understanding and confidence in the work of the policy team by local elected officials and the public.

Sequencing of Events in the CJSP

CJSP approach was originally designed to be stepwise and sequential only in that formation of the policy team was to occur before the information gathering phase, and the planning phase was to follow the information gathering phase. The activities within each phase could be completed in any order and were not time sensitive. Thus, for example, the caseflow mapping could be completed independently of the agency profiles or the community resources inventory. In practice, no two sites followed the

same progression of events, and in some sites work on the two phases proceeded simultaneously.

The frequency of site coordinator visits varied by site. The policy teams met at varied intervals and both with and without the site coordinators throughout the three years of the project. The role of the site coordinators also varied. Some of the site coordinators facilitated meetings of the policy team, while others made presentations at the meetings but did not facilitate the meetings. All of the site coordinators, however, worked with the staff and chairs of the policy teams individually in advance of policy team meetings to help define the agendas for their meetings.

Years 1-2

The first year of activities in the sites tended to include work by the policy team on the process map and resource inventories, work by the data consultants determining the availability of data, and some consideration by the policy team of the mission and vision of the criminal justice system, guided by the site coordinators.

Data collection and analysis were continuing activities over the first two years of the project in all sites and throughout the entire project in some of the sites. This element of the CJSP proved to be a much more difficult task in all sites than originally anticipated, largely due to the poor shape of the data. As discussed above, the data had to be merged from several sources in some sites and had to be collected by hand in other sites. In one site, the project was never able to produce data that the policy team members believed were accurate.

The assessment "swoops" were conducted from 12-20 months after the start of the projects. There was no single approach used to share information from the swoop. The NIC/CEPP consultant team shared some preliminary findings in most sites within a few months after the swoop, most frequently by presenting the major findings from the swoops and the preliminary data analyses verbally to policy team members at post-assessment policy team retreats. These retreats were held in late 1998 or early 1999, approximately 18-22 months after the actual start of project activities in the sites, and were facilitated by CEPP staff and the site coordinators. In some sites, the assessment findings and recommendations were used to guide the discussion at the retreat. Final assessment reports, including a first draft and a second draft reflecting feedback from the site, were prepared for three of the sites.

In February 1999, approximately two years into the project, an all-site leadership conference was held in Washington, DC to discuss leadership issues and help the sites move forward in their strategic planning. Each site (with the exception of Alaska, due to state budget constraints) sent from 3-5 members of the policy team. The conference included presentations from experts on different approaches to alternative sanctions, presentations from possible funding sources for technical assistance, and work sessions in which each site team met with its site coordinator to determine next steps in the sites. CEPP staff provided overall facilitation for the meeting.

Year 3

Activities in the final year of the project also varied greatly. Some of the activities taking place in some or all of the sites included: (1) continuing data collection and analysis; (2) holding policy team retreats; (3) hiring staff for the policy team; (4) developing action plans; and (5) developing new approaches to sanctioning. Some of the sites are still receiving technical assistance from project consultants through supplemental funding.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remaining sections of this report are as follows:

- Section 2 describes the methodology of the evaluation.
- Section 3 discusses the accomplishments of the CJSP. Six categories of accomplishments are discussed: (1) developing inter-agency collaboration based on a shared vision; (2) developing capacity to create policy based on data and information; (3) creating system-wide approaches to solving problems; (4) developing better uses of jail and alternative sanctions to incarceration; (5) streamlining the criminal process; and (6) involving the community in criminal justice policy. These accomplishments clearly demonstrate the value of the comprehensive, collaborative approach of the CJSP in creating effective criminal justice policy.
- Section 4 discusses five critical factors that related to the success of the collaborative process in the CJSP. Those factors are: (1) a policy team prepared for collaboration;

(2) effective task and process leadership; (3) a clear sense of progress and accomplishment; (4) timely availability of good information; and (5) the building of local capacity and support.

- Section 5 presents our recommendations for future replication of the CJSP.

SECTION II

EVALUATION METHODS

INTRODUCTION

This section outlines the methodology used in this process evaluation. It provides a framework for qualitatively assessing NICs' Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP) sites. In particular, this section:

- Describes the purposes of the process evaluation;
- Identifies the major research issues and questions;
- Lists outcomes and measures;
- Lists data needs and sources; and
- Describes how the data was analyzed.

We purposely developed an evaluation approach that was flexible and adaptable, with the expectation that it would be modified over time. That is, as changes took place at the CJSP sites — new issues identified, new directions taken — we expected the evaluation to evolve. As a result, the evaluation design permitted us to account for the unique qualities of each of the sites as well as the common elements across all of the sites.

PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION

The principal objective of the process evaluation was to assess the utility and effectiveness of the implementation process used by the CJSP in the demonstration sites. Through examining a variety of process, intermediate output, and project

outcome measures, the evaluation focused on what the sites did, how and why the sites did their work, and the outcomes or results they achieved. In general, the process evaluation included an assessment of how the broad-based policy team (that includes all key leaders of the criminal justice system, community, service providers, businesses, legislators/county commissioners and other key stakeholders) was formed and developed;

We expect the findings and recommendations from this evaluation will be useful to policy makers and leaders at all levels of the justice system (i.e., local, state, regional and federal) as they formulate new criminal justice and correctional sanctioning policies and seek to enhance policy making practices.

RESEARCH ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

A process analysis is essentially a descriptive, qualitative assessment of project operations. Process data are compiled through a review of project documents (e.g., site applications, memoranda, site reports), observations of project activities (e.g., meetings of the policy team), and discussions/interviews with project staff and other individuals who are an integral part of project operations (e.g., members of the CJSP policy team, site coordinators, other stakeholders). In this evaluation, we designed the process analysis to provide a comprehensive, detailed description of the steps and approach taken in each site to (1) develop a more purposeful, cost effective and coordinated system of correctional sanctions and programs and (2) achieve the goals defined by the policy making team.

The process analysis in this project serves the following five functions:

- document the project environments;
- identify research issues;
- track progress in achieving CJSP goals and identify potential obstacles;
- assess the merits and limitations of the CJSP process; and
- assess the prospects for transferring and/or adapting the process to other jurisdictions.

Document The Project Environments

The research literature on high performance teams suggests that the projects in each of the sites would be substantially affected by their institutional structures, legal frameworks, programmatic characteristics, and the past and current interactions within and among justice system agencies. Moreover, we believed that the projects would be affected by the size of the jurisdiction, population demographics, the absence or presence of immediate or pressing criminal justice system problems (e.g., jail overcrowding, the need to develop a plan to implement community corrections), local leadership, past policy making practices, and involvement of the community and other stakeholders.

Identify Research Issues

There were numerous research issues that were examined and questions that were asked in this process analysis. Many of the issues were easily defined based on the structure, purpose and goals of the project (e.g., NIC wanted jurisdictions to adopt a system-wide approach and the policy teams to work collaboratively in developing new correctional policies). Others were less readily apparent and surfaced only as the sites completed different activities and phases of the project. As the projects matured, for example, did the composition and/or role of the policy team change as a result of changing priorities or new leadership? The issues and questions in this evaluation focused on process variables (e.g., communication mechanisms), intermediate outputs (e.g., sanctions and programs inventory), and project outcomes (e.g., increased capacity of the policy team to make policy decisions based on data).

Track Progress in Achieving CJSP Goals & Identify Potential Obstacles

The CJSP identified a series of goals it expected the policy teams in each site to achieve. They included: (1) documentation of the sanctioning system; (2) agreement about desired outcomes; (3) a vision and goals for the criminal justice system; (4) policies that are aligned to the goals; and (5) a strategic plan that outlines steps for realizing those goals. It also outlined a series of activities to help the sites succeed in their efforts.

The evaluation was designed to be both formative and summative. The process analysis tracked site activities, documented obstacles the sites encountered and the

solutions implemented to overcome those obstacles, and provided early warning about emerging difficulties so that potential solutions and mid-course corrections, if desirable and/or necessary, could be effected. This last purpose — providing feedback about the process, particularly about potential difficulties/obstacles, to those providing technical assistance to the sites — was very important in this project. As we observed or heard about things that were going well and things that may have needed attention as part of our evaluation, we provided appropriate feedback to the site coordinators, so that they were aware of positive developments and difficulties and, where appropriate, could make needed changes.

Assess the Merits and Limitations of the CJSP Process

Part of this process evaluation assessed the merits and limitations of the implementation process used in each jurisdiction. For example, among other things, we examined:

- how the policy teams were formed;
- the steps that were taken to enhance collaboration among members of the policy team;
- how systems thinking was promoted;
- the steps and approach that were taken to assess the criminal justice system;
- the availability and utility of the data;
- the importance of data in shaping policy development;
- the presence of a common, shared vision for the criminal justice system;

-
- how the sites educated, involved and gained commitment from the community and other stakeholders;
 - how goals were established;
 - the steps and approach taken to developing a strategic plan;
 - the utility of other NIC resources and technical assistance;
 - the role and importance of the site coordinators; and
 - what the sites accomplished at the end of the three year project.

Ultimately, we attempted in the evaluation to determine (1) the utility and effectiveness of each of the steps or activities in achieving the project's goal(s); (2) which parts of the process did and did not contribute significantly to achieving the desired outcomes; and (3) how the approach (i.e., the activities, and the timing and sequencing of steps) might be improved.

Assess the Prospects for Transferring and/or Adapting the Process to Other Jurisdictions

NIC is committed to helping jurisdictions develop an effective system of sanctions in state and local jurisdictions. Hence, both NIC and NIJ are interested in determining whether the CJSP assessment — both the steps involved and the approach used in the assessment — results in improved criminal justice policy making and more effective correctional sanctions and programs.

This process analysis was partially designed to identify key factors that other jurisdictions should consider as they embark on a similar, system-wide process to improve their sanctioning policies and programs. It distills key success factors that are

common across sites and identifies potential barriers that all sites undertaking similar projects will need to address. For example:

- Do urban sites face a different set of obstacles than rural sites?
- Should the implementation process differ for smaller and larger jurisdictions?
- Is success dependent on, or independent of, the quality of leadership, the ability of the team to collaborate, the magnitude of the goals, or the number and availability of resources to initiate the process and carry it through to executing the strategies for implementing policies?
- What steps are necessary/sufficient to success?
- Does the sequencing of steps (i.e., their order) and does the timing of steps (i.e., whether the assessment takes 6 months, 12 months, 18 months?) make a difference in a jurisdiction's success?
- What lessons on these issues do the process evaluation findings have for implementing similar efforts in other jurisdictions?

OUTCOMES AND MEASURES

We have organized the variables we measured for the CJSP into three categories: (1) process measures, (2) intermediate outputs, and (3) project outcomes.

Process Measures

For the purpose of this evaluation, process measures are the activities and approaches that the sites used to accomplish their intermediate outputs and project outcomes. As such, we observed processes throughout the project, from the initial

formation of the policy team to implementation, refinement and evaluation of the action plans. We examined both: (1) the ways in which the sites conducted their work and (2) the effects of variables suggested by the literature as integral to fostering high performance teams.

Intermediate Outputs

The CJSP has implemented an approach that was expected to yield some interim products and reach some interim milestones that contributed to achieving the project's ultimate goals. The sanctions and programs inventory and criminal justice system map are examples of these products.

Project Outcomes

Project outcomes are the expected outcomes of the CJSP across all sites.

Exhibit II-1 lists process measures, intermediate outputs and project outcomes that we investigated across all sites. The process evaluation focuses on: (1) the degree to which the process variables were present and useful in achieving interim project outputs and overall project outcomes; (2) whether the interim outcomes were completed, the process used to develop them and their utility to the policy team; and (3) whether the project outcomes were achieved, how and when they were achieved. Consequently, it is important to note that we did not assess the quality of the products, but rather the utility of the products to the other steps in the process. For example, we did not determine whether the process map was accurate or whether the community

resources inventory was complete. We did want to know, however, how the sites used these products in developing and implementing their strategic plans.

EXHIBIT II-1 PROCESS MEASURES, INTERMEDIATE OUTPUTS AND PROJECT OUTCOMES		
Process Measures (The processes used to achieve the intermediate outputs/project outcomes)	Intermediate Outputs (Project milestones: those products/ outputs that are important to achieve the project outcomes)	Project Outcomes (The desired project results: what you hope to accomplish from the project)
Leadership practices Collaboration practices Communication practices System-wide approach Assessment process Visioning and strategic planning processes Implementation, monitoring, and change management processes Stakeholder and community involvement, education, and outreach processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information and data—assessment tools—to understand current practices and system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Comparative analysis ▶ Sanctions/ programs inventory ▶ Agency profiles ▶ Process map ▶ Offender population analysis ▶ Community resources inventory 2. Components of a strategic plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Mission and vision ▶ Core values ▶ Trends analysis ▶ Priority and strategic issues ▶ Goals and strategies ▶ Action and project plans (tasks and activities) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased capacity (e.g., ask the right questions, use data/ information, collaborate effectively) 2. Improved sanctioning policy (e.g., more integrated, more cost effective, more appropriate given the offense and the community's needs and expectations, better sanctioning tools, more coordinated among other criminal justice system agencies) 3. Institutionalized collaborative planning and change practices and processes

The following discussion describes the key questions for analysis of each of the process measures, intermediate outputs and project outcomes.

PROCESS MEASURES

Leadership Practices

Over the past two decades, social scientists have made important discoveries about leadership behaviors and practices. For example, contemporary research has helped to (1) differentiate between leadership and management behaviors; (2) understand what effective leaders do; (3) understand the requisite skills that effective leaders possess and use; (4) understand the expectations that followers have of leaders; and (5) understand the dimensions of strong leadership. There are two dimensions of leadership that must be considered:

- Dimension 1: source of authority; that is formal authority vs. informal authority; and
- Dimension 2: exercise of leadership; that is, task leadership vs. process leadership.

These two dimensions are independent of one another. Thus, task and process leadership can come from either formal or informal authority.

Formal authority arises from a person's position, such as chair of a committee, director of an organization, judge, etc. As it is tied to a position, when a person leaves a position, the person taking over the position also takes over the authority attached to the position. Informal authority arises from the way people react to a person. It may come from respect, information, money, fear, or other types of power either assumed or granted to a person.

The exercise of leadership is concerned with how the person leads. Task leadership is directive and focused on tasks at hand. Process leadership is focused on the manner in which the group works together and makes decisions. In fact, process leadership behaviors and practices are demonstrated by anyone who (1) brings about positive change by getting diverse parties to work together, or collaborate, to achieve a common purpose, vision, or goals and (2) acts to preserve the integrity of the process. Task and process leadership may be provided by one person or may be shared among two or more people. Further, either type of leadership may be provided by a person in a formal leadership role, such as the chairperson of the policy team, or by a person assuming a leadership role informally.

For purposes of this multi-year process evaluation, we are generally using leadership frameworks described by John Kotter, and by David Chrislip and Carl Larson. *Leadership*, according to Kotter, is defined as a *process* that helps direct and mobilize people and/or their ideas.¹ It includes bringing about meaningful and productive change by (1) establishing a common direction through vision and strategy; (2) aligning diverse groups of people whose cooperation is needed to achieve the vision; and (3) motivating and inspiring others to follow through with and overcome barriers to change. *Collaborative leadership*, as outlined by Chrislip and Larson, describes similar processes for bringing about meaningful and dramatic change.² They argue that collaborative leadership is demonstrated when (1) direction is established through the collaborative interaction of stakeholders; (2) alignment is achieved by building broad

based involvement through agreements about how to work together effectively; and (3) people are motivated and inspired through the commitment to and integrity of an open and credible collaborative process and good working relationships with many people.

Chrislip and Larson further believe that strong leadership of the process — rather than strong positional or tactical leadership where a particular point of view or response is advocated — is extremely important in helping collaborative efforts succeed. Examples of strong process leadership include (1) keeping stakeholders at the table through periods of frustration and skepticism; (2) helping diverse groups or individuals remain focused on a common vision, shared purpose, and/or mutual interests and concerns; (3) acknowledging the accomplishment of milestones and small successes along the way; and (4) ensuring that ground rules are adhered to and respected and that positive group norms form. In addition to examining the more traditional leadership role in groups (e.g., a person who calls a meeting, develops an agenda, runs the meetings), the PSI evaluation team focused on leadership behaviors in each of the sites that helped to:

- Keep group members focused on a common vision or shared purpose;
- Align people around a common direction and goals;
- Develop positive and trusting working relationships among all parties despite their differences;
- Keep diverse parties at the table, openly and constructively discussing matters of mutual concern;

-
- Discover common concerns and mutual interests of diverse stakeholder groups;
 - Safeguard the process to ensure that it remained open and credible;
 - Patiently deal with and work through high levels of frustration or skepticism;
 - Mobilize people and their ideas;
 - Motivate and inspire others to make changes for the good of the criminal justice system; and
 - Foster agreement and find solutions or responses to issues that meet all or part of the interests, needs, and expectations of all involved.

Collaboration Practices

Collaboration refers to the ways in which the policy team members work together. It goes beyond communication, cooperation, coordination, stakeholder involvement, and citizen input. Collaboration is a process where diverse parties with differing and oftentimes competing interests, come together and form a mutually beneficial relationship to work toward a common goal and/or solve a mutual problem. Participants constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond the purview of any one person or organization. When truly collaborating, individual agendas, group identities and loyalties, and organizational and institutional boundaries are set aside and overcome. Eventually, as members continue to work together, there is a shift from viewing the problem from a narrow parochial point of view to a broader, communal one. If this shift occurs, there is a realization that the team's ability to do something about complex issues requires them to collaborate as

equal partners rather than as advocates of particular interests, positions, or points of view.

A typical result of collaborative processes is the formation of new alliances and partnerships as participants on the team share responsibility, authority, and accountability for creating a shared vision, joint strategies, and ultimately for achieving results. In sum, collaborative processes encompass practices adopted by a group to promote and enable individual group members to work together in a joint effort that transcends and reshapes their separate interests and ultimately achieves remarkable results. Recent research has identified specific factors that must be present or deliberately built into the process — from the beginning — in order for collaborative efforts to succeed. Exhibit II-2 below presents key elements to successful collaboration.

EXHIBIT II-2: KEY ELEMENTS TO SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION

The items listed are adapted from the "Keys to Successful Collaboration" by Chrislip & Larson, 1994.)

- ✓ Good timing and a sense of immediate need for the project.
- ✓ Well organized stakeholder representatives representing all key groups who can speak and act credibly for the interest they represent.
- ✓ Broad-based involvement from many sectors and all facets of the community.
- ✓ A credible and open process that (1) ensures equal participation of all participants; (2) is protected by agreed upon ground rules, functional group norms, and healthy group dynamics; and (3) is seen as doing meaningful work.
- ✓ The involvement, commitment, and support of high-level agency, organizational, and/or political heads.
- ✓ The willingness of all participants to abide by the recommendations and action steps agreed upon through the collaborative process.
- ✓ Overcoming mistrust about motives or objectives of the process and skepticism about whether anything significant will be accomplished.
- ✓ Acknowledgment and celebration of successes along the way which provide encouragement and help to sustain credibility, momentum, and commitment.
- ✓ A shift to the broader interests of the entire community rather than participants' own parochial positions or interests; placing team goals above the interests of individual agencies.

Communication Practices

Effective and open communication practices are integral to collaborative processes. Communication includes (1) keeping policy team members informed about the status of the project and about next steps; (2) sharing important and relevant information and criminal justice system data; (3) openly discussing issues, differences, and other matters of importance among members of the policy team; and (4) sharing information, ideas and concerns between the policy team and the broader community .

The PSI evaluation team reviewed the communication practices in each of the CJSP sites from three perspectives:

1. Initial/early project communication about the CJSP from the NIC/CEPP consultants to the sites/members of the local policy teams.
 - How well did members of the policy teams understand the scope of the CJSP, the process they were engaged in, and the steps along the way?
2. Communication/information sharing throughout the project by the NIC/CEPP consultants to the members of the local policy teams and communication practices among policy team members in each site.
 - Were policy team members kept up to date on the status of CJSP activities, progress, and accomplishments?
 - Was information shared freely at policy team meetings?
 - Did policy team members openly and constructively discuss issues, differences, and other matters relevant to their work together?

-
- Was information about the CJSP shared in a timely manner?
 - What communication mechanisms/vehicles were used to update policy team members on the CJSP?
 - Did the policy team periodically assess the effectiveness of their communication practices?
3. Communication between the policy team and the broader community.
- Did the policy team share its vision, goals, and strategies with the broader community?
 - Did members of the policy team elicit the views and opinions of the public about the criminal justice system in their community?

System-Wide Approach

Adopting a system-wide approach to developing more effective sanctioning policies, options, and programs was a key value of the CJSP. That is, NIC wanted each site to take into account the effects of each part of the justice system on the actions and abilities of other parts of the justice system in producing coherent and effective sanctioning policies and programs.

A system-wide approach to developing criminal justice system policies recognizes that decisions made in every step of the process — from initial arrest to prosecution to trial to sentencing to incarceration or supervision — can affect decisions at later steps in the process. In sum, a system-wide approach requires that the policy teams critically examine and consider the effects of change on the whole criminal justice

system as they develop more effective sanctioning policies and programs in the jurisdictions.

- With regard to a system-wide approach, the PSI evaluation team investigated the degree to which:
- All key criminal justice system heads and agencies were brought into and included in the process;
- Community, business leaders, and other system users and stakeholders were involved in the process;
- The policy teams thought “systemically” as they determined goals and developed strategies; and
- The policy teams engaged in systems thinking by analyzing interdependencies between parts of the system and considering the effects of policy changes on other parts of the system as they developed new or improved approaches to correctional sanctions and programs.

Assessment Process

Having the sites make decisions on sentencing policy based on data and information was an important goal of the CJSP. The major source of information for the sites was to be the criminal justice system assessment. As originally planned, the assessments included multiple components, including.

- A system process map,
- A community services resource inventory,

-
- An offender population profile,
 - A comparative analysis (i.e., the CJSP site compared to other jurisdictions),
 - Profiles of agencies in the criminal justice system,
 - An inventory of sanctions and sanctioning programs, and
 - An analysis of criminal justice issues facing the site (i.e. the "swoop").

Most of the components were completed by the individual sites with assistance, sometimes substantial, from the NIC/CEPP consultant team. The consultant team also conducted the swoop and were expected to prepare an assessment report for each site.

- The evaluation investigated the manner in which the sites' policy teams:
- Worked together to complete the various assessment products/tools,
- Worked together to identify important data elements,
- Participated in the data collection and analysis,
- Discussed the data collectively, and
- Used the data to guide the policy team's decisions.

Visioning and Strategic Planning Process

Visioning and strategic planning are processes and tools for making fundamental decisions about the future of an organization or system. They (1) help define the direction the organization or criminal justice system intends to move toward over the long term and (2) include goals and comprehensive strategies for moving toward the desired future and improving overall performance.

The CJSP design included a task for the policy teams to engage in a visioning and strategic planning process, to develop a common criminal justice system vision, set goals, and develop comprehensive strategies for bringing about desired changes in each of the jurisdiction's sanctioning policies and programs. To assess the extent to which each site conducted strategic planning, the evaluation investigated the degree to which the policy team members in each site:

- Participated in a visioning process, developed a shared vision for the future, and demonstrated commitment to the vision;
- Involved community and business leaders, service providers and users of the system as well as appropriate members of the criminal justice system;
- Identified and described strategic or priority issues for the criminal justice system;
- Developed long term goals and comprehensive strategies to achieve the goals; and
- Demonstrated commitment to the strategic plan by following through on — or implementing — the jurisdiction's strategic plan.

Implementation, Monitoring, and Change Management Processes

Comprehensive and well-defined long range strategic plans alone will not bring about the changes and results desired from the CJSPs. Instead, it is imperative to execute or implement the strategic plans. Our experience has shown that action is more likely when policy teams or organizations—and in this case, the leaders of the criminal justice system—develop one- to two-year operational plans and/or detailed implementation, action, or project plans that include (1) measurable goals; (2) time lines

for beginning and completing various projects, objectives, and tasks; (3) assignment of responsibilities for following through on the project, objectives, or tasks; and (4) the measure(s) of success.

Moreover, monitoring progress and providing feedback and updates to people involved in bringing about changes and to the community are essential. Failure to monitor progress and/or provide feedback to all who are involved in implementing the plans and those affected by the outcomes of those plans will likely cause interest and enthusiasm to wane and focus to turn to more immediate, but possibly less important, matters. Consequently, monitoring progress continually and providing feedback and updates regularly are critical to following through on long range strategic plans.

Bringing about organizational and system-wide changes have proven to be difficult and perplexing at best. By its very nature, change represents disorder, instability, and even chaos, which is contrary to the order and stability that people seek in most aspects of their lives. It is no wonder then that it takes considerable time, patience, and relentless effort on the part of many to successfully implement organizational and system-wide change.

Inasmuch as there are countless examples of failed change efforts, the importance of managing the change process cannot be overemphasized. In addition to the above, critical ingredients to managing the change process include:

-
- Conveying the need for the change to individuals, groups, organizations, and the community (e.g., communicating the desire and urgency for the change by summarizing the present dissatisfaction, explaining the demand for the change, etc);
 - Developing a shared vision among key people, communicating the vision to others, and securing buy-in and commitment to creating a better future;
 - Creating both a process and plan for achieving the vision and goals (e.g., which includes the methods for realizing the vision and achieving the goals); and
 - Taking affirmative steps to overcome resistance to change and dealing effectively with the psychological effects of change on people (e.g., the fears and losses people will experience because of the change, that the change might create more work, loss of face, that the change may create winners and losers, etc.).

For this process measure, the evaluation investigated the manner in which the policy team members in each site:

- Developed implementation and/or action plans and followed through on them;
- Monitored and evaluated progress on the plans as well as the results achieved;
- Provided feedback and updates to people involved in the change process, stakeholders, and the community;
- Planned for how to effect change, taking into consideration the technical and human sides of change;
- Involved others affected by the change in the change planning process;

-
- Communicated the changes clearly and early and made standards and requirements regarding the change clear; and
 - Discussed and agreed upon strategies for following through on the changes and holding respective people and agencies accountable.

Stakeholder/Community Involvement, Education and Outreach Processes

The participation of stakeholders and the broader community in the CJSP was an important goal of the projects. The project expected that stakeholders and the community would be involved in a meaningful way and that education and outreach efforts would be included in project activities.

- Involvement might include participating as a member of the policy team, on a special work group, or in the development of strategies.
- Education might include any formal efforts on the part of the policy team to inform stakeholders and the community about the needs of the criminal justice system, future changes, benefits to be gained by the changes, etc.
- Outreach efforts might include steps taken to gather opinions and perceptions about the criminal justice system and gather input and feedback about expectations, proposed changes, the vision and long term goals, etc.

The evaluation investigated whether and how policy team members in each site:

- Sought out stakeholders and community members for the policy team and encouraged the community members on the policy teams to participate fully in the CJSP process;

-
- Sought to learn and understand the interests of all the various stakeholder groups, both inside and outside the criminal justice system, and members of the community in criminal justice system policy;
 - Sought to find ways to educate stakeholders and the public about the criminal justice system; and
 - Sought public input into and feedback about possible policy and program options being considered by the policy team.

INTERMEDIATE OUTPUTS

Intermediate outputs are the interim milestones achieved in each CJSP site. They include those interim products, or outputs, that are important to achieving the overall project outcomes. Below we discuss the interim outputs or milestones that were to be completed in the project.

Information/Data and Assessment Tools to Understand Current Practices/System

The evaluation investigated the degree to which and in what time frame the following components of the criminal justice system assessment were completed in each site:

- Criminal justice agency profiles;
- A criminal justice system process map (or flowchart);
- A sanctions and program inventory;
- An offender and jail population analysis;

-
- A community services resource inventory; and
 - An intensive examination of justice system issues by a consultant team.

Components of a Strategic Plan

The evaluation investigated the degree to which the following components of a strategic plan for the criminal justice system were completed in each of the sites:

- A vision for the future;
- Core values and guiding principles;
- A set of strategic or priority issues;
- Goals and strategies for dealing with the strategic issues and/or taking actions in priority areas;
- Detailed implementation, action, or project plans;
- A means for monitoring and evaluating progress on the strategic plan; and
- Mechanisms for reviewing the strategic plan.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

Project outcomes are the expected accomplishments or the results of the project across all sites. The evaluation investigated the degree to which:

- Members of the policy teams increased their capacity to collect and analyze data, use data to make policy decisions, collaborate, and effect organizational and/or system-wide change;
- The policy teams improved their sanctioning policies, options, and programs and developed better sanctioning tools;

-
- The sanctioning programs and services among criminal justice system agencies became better coordinated; and
 - Stakeholders and the community were educated about the criminal justice system and involved in the improvement and change process.

DATA NEEDS AND SOURCES

The data needs are a direct function of the outcomes we expect to measure as part of the evaluation and the information we need to share with site coordinators to effect mid-course corrections where needed. Data sources are linked to the data needs.

A list of the principal data needs and sources appears in Exhibit II-3.

**EXHIBIT II-3
DATA NEEDS AND SOURCES**

Data Needs	Data Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Description of project in each site ▶ Commitment by justice system agencies to view the system as a whole ▶ List of policy team members (agency affiliation and position, role of the public) ▶ Ground rules (e.g., charge, meeting times, rules for decision making) ▶ Roles and responsibilities of policy team members (and staff) ▶ Assessment tool to measure the key dimensions of collaboration ▶ Six areas of the initial assessment phase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Comparative analysis (b) Sanctions and program inventory (c) Criminal justice agency profiles (d) Criminal justice system flowchart (e) Offender population analysis (f) Community resources inventory ▶ Steps in strategic planning process ▶ Mission and vision statements ▶ List of strategic issues and priority areas ▶ Action plans ▶ List of data required for offender profiles ▶ Use of data in strategic planning ▶ Use of data in monitoring progress of and evaluating action plans ▶ Changes to sanctioning policy (what revised, what added) ▶ Role of the community in sanctioning policy ▶ Probation policies ▶ Site expectations of CJSP, priority issues ▶ Site lists of "success" measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Sites' applications ▶ Personal interviews with members of the policy team, members of work groups ▶ Personal interviews with site coordinators, consultants, TA providers ▶ Policy team meeting agendas, minutes, reports, materials ▶ Site coordinator and consultant reports ▶ Collaboration questionnaire ▶ Onsite observations of team and work group meetings, strategic planning retreats and the leadership conference ▶ Training and technical assistance reports ▶ Assessment report (should have findings from the first assessment phase) ▶ Strategic planning report ▶ Interviews with community program directors ▶ Public outreach efforts

Data used to make the observations and findings were collected from multiple sources. They include:

- Four or more site visits to each project site, during which PSI evaluation team members (1) interviewed policy team members; (2) observed policy team meetings; (3) observed some of the assessment swoop; (4) observed the post-assessment strategic planning retreats; (5) observed post-retreat work group and policy team meetings; and (6) conducted debriefing meetings approximately three and nine months after the end of the CJSP;
- A review of project documents from each site, including (1) the original application and supporting materials; (2) minutes of policy team meetings produced by the sites and the site coordinators; (3) assessment reports, where completed; and (4) other documentation of site activities produced by site coordinators and the sites;
- Discussions with site coordinators by telephone, during site visits, and at site coordinators' meetings;
- Discussions with the lead local person in each of the sites by telephone and during site visits; and
- An analysis of the results of a survey on collaboration administered twice to all the policy team members in each site, first during the period from 14-20 months into the project, depending on the site, and again approximately 30 months into the project.

HOW DATA ARE ANALYZED AND PRESENTED

A process analysis is a qualitative assessment of project operations and outcomes. It is primarily descriptive and will serve the functions described above. If there is an impact evaluation of the CJSP, the process evaluation will be valuable in helping understand and interpret the quantitative findings from that impact evaluation.

The evaluation focuses both on outcomes across sites and outcomes that are site specific. At the site level, we evaluate the issues that are unique to each site. This includes those issues that appeared in the sites' applications, those that appeared as part of the assessment activities (e.g., data availability), and those that appeared as part of the strategic planning activities (e.g., priority issues, system goals). We also look at sites' characteristics or events to understand better why certain outcomes resulted and why outcomes across sites varied.

The cross-site analysis examines issues and themes that are common to all the sites (e.g. collaborative decision making on the policy teams). A major objective of this analysis is to determine the extent to which the experiences and outcomes from the demonstration projects can provide a guide to other jurisdictions interested in replicating the CJSP model and approach. In Section 6 of this report we present a set of recommendations from sites' experiences aimed at helping other jurisdictions adapt the model and approach to their own specific needs. This includes ideas about such issues as (1) what agency should sponsor the process, (2) how the process should be staffed, (3) what resources need to be available, (4) what data should be reviewed, and (5) how

to avoid difficulties or minimize obstacles along the way (e.g., promoting systems thinking, engaging in strategic planning).

Most of the data presentation is descriptive, using narrative description, tables and charts to present the information. Simple tabular methods (e.g., listing the ideas sites have for amending the CJSP process based on their experiences) are advantageous because they are relatively easy to understand and interpret. Crosstabular data is used to compare findings across sites or by selected characteristics of the sites (e.g., population served). We twice administered a survey of collaboration practices that uses scales to measure how extensively policy team members are collaborating in their decision-making processes. The comparative cross-site findings from the two surveys are presented in Appendix A, using frequencies and means to summarize the results and quantitative analytic approaches to test for differences over time in sites' collaboration practices.

SECTION III

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PROJECT (CJSP)

INTRODUCTION

This section presents a discussion of the outcomes that were achieved in the CJSP sites. These accomplishments clearly demonstrate the value of the comprehensive, collaborative approach of the CJSP in creating effective criminal justice policy. The substantial achievements of the CJSP sites should encourage the National Institute of Corrections to promote and support this type of a planning process in other sites.

OVERVIEW OF SITE ACHIEVEMENTS

The achievements of the CJSP fall into the following categories of outcomes, all of which were important objectives of the CJSP.

Developing Inter-agency Collaboration as a Way of Doing Business

Promoting enhanced collaboration among criminal justice system agency heads was an important focus of the CJSP. The policy teams were encouraged to be more aware of how they are working together and continually evaluate how well they were doing to meet that goal. The emphasis on collaboration practices has likely been an important factor in producing the climate of collaboration that has developed and which hopefully will endure in many of the sites. All sites report that collaboration among justice system agencies has grown substantially as a result of the project.

A necessary condition for a site's participation in the CJSP was that they have a policy team. Several of the participating sites had existing groups that included leaders from key justice system agencies and those groups became the policy team for the CJSP. Other sites had groups (e.g., a jail committee) working on discrete criminal justice system issues, but no single group to serve as a voice for the entire system. Those sites created new policy teams specifically for the CJSP.

Regardless of how they were created, the CJSP helped give the policy teams a reason and a means to work together, something that may have been lacking in their jurisdictions. In all the sites, the policy teams included the top leaders from a broad range of justice system agencies and other key stakeholders in the jurisdiction; essentially all the people necessary to create and put into effect a more purposeful, cost effective and coordinated system of correctional sanctions and programs. Most sites have policy teams that are continuing to work beyond the end of the project and are dealing with a range of justice system issues in a way that encourages collaboration among all justice system agencies.

Developing Capacity to Create Policy Based on Data and Information

One of the goals of the CJSP was to assist sites in getting and using good data and information to enhance policy decisions. The CJSP assisted sites by: (1) analyzing jail data and developing profiles of who was being held in jail; (2) assessing the criminal justice needs and problems of the site; and (3) providing technical assistance on best practices. The CJSP data consultants helped sites collect and analyze jail data and

trained local criminal justice staff to conduct their own analyses. The project also provided training in one site on the use of the Level of Service Inventory (LSI) as a classification tool. Best practices were introduced to sites in the form of presentations by national experts.

In addition, policy team members in some sites have found selected components of the assessment (e.g., caseflow map) useful to their own agency work. For example, some team members have incorporated the findings from the caseflow mapping effort into their staff training materials. Similarly, the findings from the data collection and analysis work caused one site to realize that jail overcrowding was not a major problem in the site as thought previously and helped another site to understand better some of the issues surrounding their jail release policies.

Creating System-wide Approaches to Solving Problems

One of the major goals of the CJSP was to encourage the policy teams to adopt a system-wide approach to addressing criminal justice policy issues, particularly understanding the ways in which decisions made in every criminal justice agency affect decisions in other agencies and ultimately the use and effectiveness of criminal justice sanctions. Developing system-wide solutions to criminal justice problems has been an important achievement of the CJSP in many of the sites. This includes sharing of resources among justice system agencies to create programs or to preserve important programs faced with elimination due to budgetary cutbacks or other reasons. It also includes using facilities in a more effective manner.

Through the project, all sites came to recognize that all agency actions in the criminal justice system have downstream or upstream effects on other agencies. Most sites are now beginning to involve all agencies affected by a policy decision in developing the policy, not just the agency that will carry out the policy. The policy teams have offered, at least in some sites, an official forum for the major stakeholders in the criminal justice system to discuss their problems and communicate their needs. Part of taking a system-wide view is streamlining the criminal justice process. This includes eliminating steps that can result in an offender's spending unnecessary time in jail. Unnecessary delays at all stages of the criminal justice process can result in offenders' spending additional time in jail. The extra time in jail then affects the need for jail beds. Several sites took steps to reduce jail time by streamlining the handling of offenders.

Developing Better Uses of Jail and Alternative Sanctions to Incarceration.

Encouraging sites to rethink their sanctioning policies and develop a continuum of sanctioning options including alternatives to incarceration was the ultimate substantive goal of the CJSP. The CJSP assisted sites in developing a variety of ways to better use jail and alternative sanctions to incarceration, including new treatment programs for certain offenders and methods to make pretrial release programs more effective and useful.

Involving the Community in Criminal Justice Policy

Involving elected political officials and the community in criminal justice system policy making was a goal of the CJSP that was achieved in varying degrees in the sites. Some sites included citizen members and elected officials on the policy team. In addition, some sites have developed community outreach programs.

SITE ACHIEVEMENTS

Jackson County

In Jackson County, the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) is a statutory creation, and the Adult Subcommittee, which served as the policy team for the CJSP, is continuing to meet and consider system-wide policy issues. All the major players have continued to be involved. The participation of Health and Human Services has been particularly useful. Further, through the use of subcommittees, other criminal justice agency personnel are being brought into the process. Collaboration has become a way of doing business. Even new administrators are now being hired by inter-disciplinary teams. Next year the LPSCC will focus on more data collection, developing assessment tools for better release policies, especially pretrial, and increasing communication with the public.

One issue of inter-agency collaboration that became important in Jackson County was the required merger of state probation into the probation departments of each county by the Oregon Legislature. The cultures of the two departments were quite different: the county probation department is primarily involved with community

corrections, and its officers do not carry weapons, while the state probation officers were more engaged in enforcement and supervision and did carry weapons. The project assisted the merger of the state probation officers into the county probation department by providing technical assistance through a team-building consultant.

An important indicator of the degree to which collaboration has been institutionalized is the ability of the policy team to maintain collaboration with changes in membership. There were important changes in the leadership of several criminal justice agencies in Jackson County, which were reflected in changes in the membership of the policy team, over the course of the project. These changes included the jail commander, the Chief of Police of the City of Medford, and the Director of Community Corrections. The chair of the policy team also changed part way into the project. With all these changes, the climate of collaboration remained strong.

The County Commission hired a staff person to work with the LPSCC half time. Other county staff are being trained by the CJSP data expert to handle data collection and analysis, including how to identify relevant data, extract data from existing information systems, and analyze the data. The staff position has now been made full time. Research on best practices presented at the LPSCC retreat has been useful in developing new sanctioning policies and treatment programs, in particular a cognitive restructuring program in the work release facility.

Further, the LPSCC is making much better use of data to inform decisions. The data at first seemed counterintuitive, but after working with the data over time and

understanding what was behind the numbers, they came to trust the data. They now accept that the wrong people were being held in jail. They are developing a pretrial release matrix, based on data. Further, they have obtained supplemental funding to receive additional technical assistance from the CJSP data expert, both in training staff and in analyzing the data.

With regard to enhanced collaboration and taking system-wide approaches to solving problems, Jackson County has started to share resources among agencies in a variety of ways. For example, the Sheriff has agreed to provide beds in the work release facility for social service treatment holds. Also, the LPSCC has determined to protect the cognitive restructuring program in the work release facility against upcoming budget cuts, even if other agencies have to absorb higher cuts.

One of the major accomplishments in Jackson County has been in improving the use of its jail. In Jackson County, the jail is under a Federal cap. At the start of the CJSP, the jail was going over the cap every weekend, requiring the jail to release about 50 inmates every Monday morning to meet the cap. One of the major defining problems for the LPSCC in entering the CJSP was the need to do a better job of deciding whom to release. Through a variety of changes in processing offenders throughout the criminal justice system, Jackson County has changed its jail usage in a way that has eliminated the need for early release of inmates from the jail to meet the Federal cap. Those changes have involved the judges, the jail, probation, community corrections, law

enforcement and Health and Human Services. The major changes include the following.

- At first, only the jail was considered, although less dangerous offenders were being held longer at the work release facility. Some inmates at the work release facility even purposely misbehaved in order to be sent to the jail, knowing that they would likely be released quicker. Now, the inmates at the work release facility are included in determining whom to release, and some inmates are moved from the jail to the work release facility. There is better joint use of all the facilities.
- The Sheriff has placed a breathalyzer in the detoxification center run by the Department of Health and Human Services. This has allowed law enforcement officers to take suspected drunk driving offenders directly to the detoxification center, rather than taking them to the jail first for breath analysis. Those who fail the test can then be held at the detox center. Since this was done, the number of drunk drivers held at the detox center rather than the jail has quadrupled, from 4-5 individuals every Friday and Saturday night to 15-20 individuals.
- Oregon statutes require that every county create a Supervisory Authority to determine whom to release or hold in jail. In Jackson County, the Department of Community Corrections has been designated as the Supervisory Authority. Judges sentence people to the legal and physical custody of the Supervisory Authority rather than directly to jail. The Supervisory Authority then decides who goes to jail and who goes to alternative programs.

-
- The jail has added weekend coverage by release officers, so that individuals brought to jail who are eligible for release can be released immediately.

Further, the Sheriff wants the officers in the jail to have release authority, so that some offenders can be released before they go through the process of being admitted into the jail (including paperwork, change of clothing, etc). A release matrix will have to be developed. Further, the Sheriff is seeking to expand the authority of the police to arrest on citation and release is being broadened to allow release of people arrested for FTA if they are not dangerous. He is awaiting a legal opinion on this. In addition, as noted above, a state-certified breathalyzer has been put into the detox center, so officers can take DUIs directly there rather than to the jail.

Jackson County has developed a variety of programs to provide alternatives to incarceration, including: (1) a call back program through community corrections to remind people of their court appearances and reduce FTAs, which has reduced FTAs from 33 percent to 10 percent for the people in the program; (2) the purchase of a transition house, with treatment programs, for people coming out of work release; and (3) the development of a cognitive restructuring program in the work release facility. The cognitive restructuring program has been very successful, with a very low recidivism rate, and is now also being used for juveniles.

With regard to alternative sanctions to incarceration, in Jackson County there is now widespread acceptance, even by the County Commission and conservative political and religious groups, that you cannot build a criminal justice system on

punitive sanctions alone. A public opinion survey conducted by the LPSCC showed that the public was much more supportive of alternative sanctions for appropriate offenders than the justice system community had thought. The survey also highlighted public lack of understanding of community corrections. As a result, a public seminar on community corrections was presented through the LPSCC. Also, the LPSCC meetings are being televised. Through the CJSP, the county elected officials have learned a great deal about the criminal justice system and are better able to explain to the public how the justice system operates.

Tulsa County

Tulsa County has developed a detailed community sentencing plan. This plan was originally required by statute and developed with the expectation of state funding of some of the programs providing alternatives to incarceration. After the state legislature suspended funding for community sentencing, Tulsa County persisted in developing implementation plans and determined to put the plan into effect even without state funding. Tulsa has now been designated a pilot site by the State of Oklahoma and will receive some state funding. The Council members believe that the CJSP helped Tulsa County to become a "poster child for community sentencing" in Oklahoma.

The Tulsa County Criminal Justice Planning and Policy Council is continuing to meet, and everyone agrees that the project was instrumental in getting people from the different criminal justice agencies talking to each other. The criminal justice agencies

now get together on a regular basis to discuss common problems, and as a result, collaboration among the criminal justice agencies in the county has increased substantially through the project. Having everyone at the table brings different sources and platforms of information together, and as a result, problems are being identified early rather than having to be fixed later. In particular, the Council has broadened the perspective of the judges in the county, both in terms of understanding the effect on other agencies of what the judges do and in terms of learning what resources are available in the county to assist the criminal justice system. The decision-making process developed through the CJSP is a major lasting benefit of the project to the County.

The Council is working through several subcommittees and task forces. Based on the jail data developed in the CJSP, the Council has formed a minority subcommittee to focus on over-representation of minorities in the justice system, and especially in the jail. It has held two public forums on the issue. In addition, the Council has a judicial subcommittee, which is working on implementation issues for the community sentencing pilot program, and two task forces, a drunk driving task force and a jail diversion task force. The drunk driving task force is looking at alternative ways to handle DUIs other than locking them up in jail. The jail diversion task force has developed a mental health jail diversion program. Through this program offenders with mental health needs are getting treatment and monitoring. Both the City of Tulsa

and the Tulsa Police Department, through a local law enforcement grant, are helping the County fund the program.

The Council has begun taking a system-wide approach to solving criminal justice problems. A pretrial hearing step was eliminated when analysis showed that the step rarely accomplished anything and just added possible jail time for offenders who were in jail pretrial. The process mapping created as part of the assessment highlighted the problem. On another issue, the Council worked together as a team to protect the pretrial release program against a lawsuit by bail bondsmen claiming that release without bond was a violation of the Oklahoma Constitution. Also, in addressing the over-representation of minorities in the justice system, the Council is looking at the whole criminal justice process from apprehension and arrest through final disposition of the case.

An important achievement of the CJSP in Tulsa County has been the enhanced ability of the criminal justice system to develop policy based on information. Several information tools have been especially useful. The justice system is developing another process map to help assess how the handling of DUI offenders affects jail usage. The County has also increased its data analysis capability, particularly the ability to measure and analyze program outcomes, and will be developing data to assess the success of the community sentencing program in the County. The jail data developed through the project was instrumental in highlighting the problem of minority over-representation. The local data showed that this was a local problem as well as a national problem.

The LSI has been an especially useful tool for the county. Initially, the project brought in a national expert to train the county in the use of the LSI. A pretest was run on 100 inmates, and the Council then used the results to identify what treatment programs would be needed for a viable community sentencing program. They then did a service inventory and developed cost figures for the community sentencing plan. The result was a community sentencing plan that became the model for the state, as it was based on information and not guesswork. Also as a result of the pretest, a literacy program was instituted in the jail. The county then started using the LSI as the key assessment tool in determining which offenders are eligible for diversion to treatment programs under Oklahoma's Community Sentencing Act. Through the experiences of Tulsa County, the LSI has now been adopted as the assessment tool for Community Sentencing statewide in Oklahoma.

The criminal justice system in the County now also appreciates the value of involving the public in developing criminal justice policy. The public forums on minority over-representation have been especially productive, in terms of highlighting problems and developing constructive ideas for addressing those problems. In addition, the citizen members of the Council play an important role in assisting the Council to communicate with the public.

Portage County

After the joint Wood and Portage County policy team disbanded, both Wood County and Portage County formed their own policy teams. The Portage County

Justice Committee has 35 members, including County Board members and representatives from community service agencies. The County has hired a full time justice system planner to work with the Justice Committee. The judges of the criminal court are now referring decisions on criminal justice policy issues to the Justice Committee. The Committee members have become comfortable with broad participation. The active participation of the Public Defender has also been helpful.

The CEPP site coordinator provided assistance to the Justice Committee in structuring the large team. The Committee decided to work through a variety of standing and *ad hoc* subcommittees, all of whom report to the Committee as a whole. One of the *ad hoc* subcommittees is looking at jail utilization issues, including the use of assessment tools such as the LSI and Objective Based Classification, the expanded use of alternative sanctions such as electronic monitoring and day reporting, and a new work release facility. The subcommittees are also involving agency personnel who are not on the Portage County Justice Committee.

The Justice Committee is looking at a variety of alternative sentencing options, including the expanded use of alternative sanctions such as electronic monitoring and day reporting, and a new work release facility. The County Board, through its members on the Justice Committee, is learning about long term needs of the criminal justice system and not focusing just on short term money issues.

As an example of the new level of collaboration within the criminal justice system in Portage County, an issue arose concerning the ability of caseworkers to detain

juveniles. In the past, a decision on this issue would have been made by a small group of people, without a complete assessment of the impact on other parts of the system. Instead, the issue was referred to the Portage County Justice Committee for a decision, based on a complete assessment.

Wood County

In Wood County the Criminal Justice Task Force has been officially recognized by the County Board of Supervisors as the lead body to consider criminal justice issues. The Task Force, which is really just beginning its work, is looking at developing prevention programs in the schools, starting a program for people to work off fines, working with the Sheriff to consider the possibility of building a new jail, and developing programs to educate justice system agencies on Wisconsin's new truth in sentencing bill.

Dutchess County

In Dutchess County, the Criminal Justice Council (CJC) is continuing to meet. The Council has created an Executive Committee of 15-16 members and six subcommittees, including a subcommittee to look at data and one to work on community involvement. The Council has learned that it needs to be a working group, and this expectation is being transmitted by example to new members. There is now a shared vision, a sense of mission and increased collaboration among justice system agencies in the County. The Council has increased its credibility, strength and respect

in the legislature and the community by working together and presenting a united front and even succeeded in obtaining increased funding from the legislature this year.

The CJC has created a number of subcommittees to do the substantive work, including a data subcommittee, a community involvement subcommittee and a sanctions subcommittee. The data subcommittee has been looking at data availability issues. Through the work of the CJC, the County now has access to state data, including arrest data from the State of New York DCJS, and staff trained to use SPSS. In addition, the County has received a federal grant of \$134,000 to fund a research position. The community involvement subcommittee of the CJC is developing methods for expanding community involvement, in the recognition that, in order to compete for funds, it must prove to the average citizen that the criminal justice system is doing its job.

As the county thinks about expanding the jail, it has developed a new view of custodial needs and the difference between beds and cells. They are now looking at total bed needs, including beds in halfway houses and residential treatment facilities as well as beds in jail. The sanctions subcommittee is looking at a variety of diversion programs and other alternative sanctions. The CJC has defined six goals of probation and is working with the State University of New York (SUNY) at Albany to develop performance measures to measure each of the six goals. The county now also has increased capacity to do risk evaluation of inmates for classification.

The County found great value in having outside consultants look at their criminal justice system. The outside consultants had the ability to ask questions that the people on the Criminal Justice Council could not ask, either because they were too close to the issues to see how their organization and process could affect outcomes or because they were too tied to each other personally to ask the hard questions.

St. Lawrence County

In St. Lawrence County, the policy team is continuing to meet once a month, always has an agenda, and is recognized as a decision making body. The team is becoming much more of a collaborative body, as team members have come to recognize that their goals are not in conflict and are seeking cooperative approaches to resolving problems. They now consult everyone in the system when making decisions that affect them all, so that impacts can be discussed up front. There is a local magistrates' representative on the policy team to bring issues to the table regarding that group.

The policy group is coordinating better with other parts of the system as well. Problems in dealing with the New York State Parole Office have been resolved. The Conditional Release Commission has formalized eligibility criteria, and the prison warden is given the opportunity to comment on all applications for conditional release. A Drug Task Force has been formed to coordinate approaches to dealing with drug problems. In addition, agencies are alerting each other to things that might affect their work, such as an impending big drug bust.

The project helped St. Lawrence County recognize the value of data in understanding problems. The data analysis showed that the magistrates were not the cause of jail overuse. This then led the team to look at other causes. The County is now looking at implementing a system-wide management information system across all justice system agencies and using the SPSS data software system to conduct its own data entry and analysis. The jail now creates a computer list every week updating the status of pre-trial offenders that is made available to all criminal justice agencies.

The process map has helped them to identify gaps in the system. The League of Women Voters is using the process map as part of their public education campaign.

St. Lawrence County has implemented mental health and AODA evaluation and counseling in the jail, to get people help while in jail and connect them with services after they are released. All court requests for CPL 720 mental health evaluations are sent to the Mental Health Evaluator for preliminary assessment prior to the issuance of a court order. They have also placed a social worker in the jail, primarily to help inmates fill out medicaid applications, and are planning to place a full-time (40 hours per week) public health nurse in the jail next year. Having these services in the jail has saved money for Social Services, as fewer inmates have to be sent to outpatient clinics for treatment.

The time from plea to sentencing in the County has been reduced to two weeks for incarcerated inmates and four weeks for all others, thus saving jail time awaiting case disposition. In particular, they are processing drug cases faster. In addition, the

Public Defender assignments are now being made in one day. This contributes to moving cases faster. St. Lawrence County is also making more use of electronic monitoring and other alternatives to incarceration. They have moved from an initial 10 monitoring units to 50 units, reducing the burden on the jail. The project made them more aware of these possibilities.

State of Alaska

While the policy team — the Criminal Justice Assessment Commission (CJAC) — disbanded at the end of the project and no longer meets, collaboration among justice system agencies has increased due to the project, and the work of the CJAC has structured a large part of the discussion of criminal justice policy in Alaska, both substantively and in the process. There is a better common understanding of the criminal justice system among leaders of the various justice system agencies and the state legislature. Members of the legislature who were exposed to or involved in the work of the CJAC have become more informed about the criminal justice system, and some have even changed their positions on some issues.

Some policy team members cited the assessment report as "...the most comprehensive description of the Alaska criminal justice system to date." The policy team has encouraged the work groups to integrate the findings from the assessment report into their recommendations for justice system improvements. The project highlighted the lack of data system-wide throughout the state. As a result, the state is working on improving its information systems.

In Alaska, the policy team challenged the work groups to identify problems and recommended solutions that were shared across jurisdictions throughout the state. The team was sensitive to issues that affect the justice system throughout the state, not just a single locale (e.g., City of Anchorage). As a result of its broad-based representation, the team appreciated the resource implications of selected issues and established some committees (e.g., Alcohol Work Group) to address issues that were endemic to the criminal justice system throughout the state. The CJAC report has been influential in setting alcohol policy for the state.

Alaska has developed several programs for mentally ill offenders, including a mentally ill offender court and a Jail Alternative Services program for mentally ill offenders. It has also revised its probation/parole revocation practices and is implementing the changes statewide. All of these changes affect jail usage.

Maricopa County

Although Maricopa County did not remain in the CJSP beyond the assessment phase, the policy team has initiated a pilot project to reduce the backlog of cases in the criminal courts. This was a major presenting problem for the site at the start of the CJSP, and the proposed solution being tested has required cooperation from most of the agencies in the justice system.

Policy team members credited the assessment report with helping underscore the need for better information upon which to make policy decisions. They have acted on the report's findings to hire additional researchers in the adult probation department

and the court. Further, they have incorporated many of the report's recommendations into their pilot program for reducing case backlogs and case processing time in the criminal courts.

SECTION IV

FACTORS FOR A SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

From our observations of the process variables described in Section II, our evaluation highlighted five critical factors that related to the success of the collaborative process in the CJSP. Those factors are: (1) a policy team prepared to work together with a clear project plan; (2) effective task and process leadership; (3) a clear sense of progress and accomplishment; (4) timely availability of good information; and (5) the building of local capacity and support. This section discusses each of those factors.

A POLICY TEAM PREPARED TO WORK TOGETHER WITH A CLEAR PROJECT PLAN

A necessary condition for a site's participation in the CJSP was that they have a policy team. Several of the participating sites had existing groups that included leaders from key justice system agencies, and those groups became the policy team for the CJSP. Other sites had groups (e.g., a jail committee) working on discrete criminal justice system issues, but no single group to serve as a voice for the entire system. Those sites created new policy teams specifically for the CJSP. Regardless of how they were created, the CJSP helped give the policy teams a reason to exist and a means to work together, something that may have been lacking in their jurisdictions.

It is important for a policy team in a project of this nature to be officially recognized and have the authority to make decisions for the criminal justice system. In some of the sites, the recognition and authority came from the state legislature or from a local governing body such as a county commission. Several of the policy teams in the CJSP were committees that had prior existence and statutory authority. Those teams had built-in legitimacy. In other sites, the policy team derived its legitimacy *de facto* from having all the key justice system leaders at the table. In one site, the policy team lacked the formal authority it needed to serve as a policy-making body for the criminal justice system, and other local committees formed and made decisions that overrode the work of the policy team..

The policy team must be ready to work on the project. Initially this means that the members of the policy team must have a clear perception of the need for the project. Not all sites that were accepted for inclusion in the project were ready, as evidenced by the early dropout of two sites from the project. Timing is important. One site was selected for the project despite the fact that it really had no pressing problem at the start of the project. At the time of selection, NIC decided to include the site as a sort of "control" site, to see if a policy team could be formed and work in the absence of any immediate pressing need or problem that had to be solved. The answer, at least in this project, was "no." That site never really got going, and once a couple of the people who had initiated the application left the justice system, there was no support for the policy team to continue to meet.

At the time of site selection there must be clear communication from the site selection team to all the proposed members of the policy team as to what is likely to be required, in terms of time and resources, to complete the project. Resources include time of the policy team members, adequate staff support for the policy team, time required of agency line staff to produce information and other work products, and other resources to complete project activities (such as people to collect data). The letters of cooperation from the criminal justice agency heads in the site applications often appeared to be form letters, indicating that in every site some of the individuals writing letters of support may not have comprehended what the project would entail. Our interviews confirmed that this was the case, and that the majority of the policy team members in every site did not really understand what the CJSP was all about, despite the fact that they had signed letters of support. Ideally, the selection team in each site should try to meet with all key individuals as a group, rather than individually, and should be ready to present a clear picture of what will be done in the project, including time frames. This would require that all or at least most of the members of the policy team be identified as part of the site selection process.

In the process of site selection, it is also important to assess the ways in which the prospective policy team members are able to work with each other and potential barriers to collaboration. The sites differed with regard to the climate of collaboration at the beginning of the project. One site liaison recommended that during NIC's initial, pre-selection site visit NIC staff should meet with the policy team (if one has been

established) and observe the dynamics of the meeting (e.g., how meetings are conducted, how team members interact, whether team members appear engaged and enthusiastic). The elapsed time between site selection and project start-up was a problem in some of the sites. For most of the sites, at least six months elapsed between their selection as a CJSP site and project start up. In several sites, that period of time, which spanned an election, was long enough so that the moving forces behind the project had changed (e.g., presenting problem not as critical, key people left office or changed positions). The original commitment to the CJSP thus had weakened by the start of the project, at least in some sites. There may be many legitimate reasons for delaying the start of the project (e.g., need first to establish a policy team in those sites without one). However, if sites are ready to proceed, the project start date should follow closely upon site selection, even if it means that all sites do not start at the same time. Our interview findings suggest that some sites would have preferred starting sooner and believed some crucial momentum was lost by waiting.

In all the sites, the policy teams included the top leaders from a broad range of justice system agencies and other key stakeholders in the jurisdiction, including leaders from the judiciary, court administration, law enforcement, prosecution, defense, probation, corrections and social services; essentially all the people necessary to create and put into effect a more purposeful, cost effective and coordinated system of correctional sanctions and programs. The results of the first collaboration survey in all sites confirmed that the membership of the policy team reflected all of the major

stakeholders in the criminal justice system. Elected officials, such as county commissioners, were included as members on some of the teams. The sites had differing views about citizen members: some found them to be useful members of the team, especially where the team was willing to take the time to educate them; other sites believed that citizen members would be unable to participate effectively.

The participation of two system actors, judges and public defenders, posed problems in some sites. Having judges on the policy team proved important to most of the sites. For some decisions the agreement of the judges was critical, and for most decisions the support of the judges was an important factor. One judge indicated that having a forum where everyone is at the table avoided ethical concerns of talking to the different players in the justice system privately. In at least one site, however, the judges did not think that it was appropriate for them to sit on a policy making committee of this nature. The public defenders would not participate on the policy team in some sites, feeling that participating would compromise their adversary role. In several sites, however, the public defenders were active participants. They believed that working toward a more rational criminal justice system provided benefits to his clients that outweighed any ethical concerns that they might have. Further, they did not believe that serving on the policy team in any way compromised their ability to represent their clients fully. In the sites with citizen members on the policy team, problems arose about how to integrate them into the team. All but two of the policy teams included citizen or community members, but the effectiveness of the citizen members varied from site to

site. For example, a few citizen members indicated that they lacked some of the knowledge necessary to participate in and contribute fully to the work of the policy team. They sensed frustration on the part of some justice system members when they needed to be educated or informed about the criminal justice system. Some citizen and community members reported not feeling as well informed as some of the others, in part because many of the policy team members were in regular contact with each other in their working lives outside of policy team meetings and often discussed the issues being addressed through the CJSP informally. Thus, if citizen or community members are included as members of the policy team, better mechanisms should be found to keep them more up to date on the events and discussions that take place between CJSP meetings.

In most of the sites, the top leadership from the agencies involved served in person on the team. In some instances, however, the *formal* membership of the policy teams (i.e., agency heads) was not the same as the *operational* membership. That is, sometimes the agency head did not attend meetings or participate even when attending. Sometimes the head sent a "second" to attend a policy team meeting on his/her behalf. In one site, for example, some of the elected officials (e.g. the sheriff, the district attorney) sent deputies to attend as seconds. The seconds often had no background to the CJSP and no decision making authority. They also were not always the same from meeting to meeting, so there was no continuity in the messages taken to or from the policy team meeting. Sending deputies also (1) required a second level of

communication, (2) sometimes slowed the decision-making ability of the policy team, and (3) changed the group dynamics such that collaboration was adversely affected.

The policy teams varied greatly in size, from 9 in one site to 28 in another. The larger teams had some difficulty making policy decisions and promoting collaboration among team members. On the other hand, some sites found that larger teams allowed for broader participation and more inclusivity. One way that the larger teams worked was to create a smaller executive committee and working subcommittees from among the team members and let the subcommittees make decisions about the project's direction and activities. It was important for subcommittees to report to the policy team as a whole at regular intervals.

The statewide team in Alaska had to deal with some unique logistical problems, due to the fact that the team members were scattered geographically. Team members did not have contact with each other on a day-to-day basis, unlike members of the local policy teams. Maintaining communication among team members thus took more effort. Further, getting people together on a monthly basis was more difficult, due to the added time required for travel.

The results of the first collaboration survey highlighted the need for better staff support in many of the sites, a need that was met in all of the sites by the end of the project. Those policy teams with inadequate staff support had difficulty in producing the supporting materials, such as meeting minutes, that are critical to monitoring the progress of the team. Staff support was necessary for arranging meeting logistics,

producing useful minutes of team meetings, obtaining information and other resources for the team when necessary, arranging the schedules for site coordinator meetings and other tasks. One site had a professional staff person for the policy team who was not only able to help create meeting agendas but also knowledgeable enough about the issues to prepare drafts of written products. Policy teams that started out without adequate staff support had a number of difficulties, including a lack of adequate documentation of what was done and difficulty in completing some project tasks. By the end of the project, all of the sites that were still active had recognized the need for good professional staff support for the project and hired at least part time staff or specifically designated a person to work with and support the policy team.

Teams need some structure to function effectively. Responses to the first collaboration survey indicate that setting clear ground rules, team roles and structure was a problem in all of the sites except one. That is, with the exception of one site, all of the sites had relatively low scores for (1) having explicitly established ground rules and norms about how the team will work together and (2) having clearly defined roles for policy team members. Of the eight categories found to be important in measuring the effectiveness of collaborative efforts, this category ranked second to the last among the policy teams.

Maintaining open discussion is perhaps the most critical ground rule. Openly discussing issues, differences and other matters of importance was not difficult for some policy teams, but, at least initially in the project, very difficult for others. In

general, where there were high levels of trust and respect among policy team members, where the members had good working relationships, and where the size of the team was manageable, team members were more likely to raise, discuss, and resolve difficult issues. Where teams did not have healthy group dynamics or high levels of trust or respect for some members, did not want to confront personal or systemic biases and prejudices, and/or had a large policy team (e.g., greater than 20 people), it seemingly was very difficult for them — or they were reluctant — to raise, discuss, and resolve important matters.

To operate effectively, the policy teams must develop collaborative behaviors. Promoting collaboration among justice system agencies through the policy team was a critical goal of the project. Collaboration and systems and strategic thinking involve a different paradigm from the day-to-day problem solving that tends to dominate the energy of criminal justice system actors. The criminal justice system is driven by individual cases and daily problems that require immediate resolution, such as whom to arrest or release from jail. Strategic thinking requires looking at underlying causes, interactions among agencies, time frames that extend beyond immediate problems, and desired futures. It requires looking for common causes of seemingly unrelated problems and long term rather than immediate payoffs. This can be frustrating to busy people facing problems that demand immediate solutions. Unless the participants in the process are helped to understand what the end results of the strategic planning

process will look like and how those results will benefit the system, they will naturally drift toward consideration of more immediate problems.

Critical to collaboration is focusing on the broader interests of the entire justice system and the community. Having the policy teams take a system-wide view of criminal justice problems was one of the major goals of the CJSP. This requires the open and honest participation of all criminal justice agencies in the planning process and a willingness to involve other stakeholders, including the broader community, where appropriate. Collaborative behaviors and systems thinking frequently have to be taught. Both require that agencies look beyond their own needs and consider the effects of their actions on other agencies. This will take time, especially in a system where agencies have competing roles and missions, where politics may frustrate interagency cooperation and the search for long term solutions to problems, and where power is often defined by an agency's share of resources. Also, if a decision that affects the larger justice system can be made by a single agency (e.g., charging decisions), it is sometimes difficult to take the time necessary to consult with other agencies, attempt to analyze potential side effects of decisions, and seek joint decisions. The benefits of a collaborative approach may not be obvious to an agency faced with the pressure of daily problems.

EFFECTIVE TASK AND PROCESS LEADERSHIP

Providing process and task leadership proved to be critical throughout the CJSP. Task leadership was important to keep the policy teams moving toward goals and

achieving interim project outputs and ultimate policy outcomes. Process leadership was important in keeping all the key people at the table and participating fully in the project. Where either of those was lacking, the policy team tended to flounder. Further, both aspects of leadership were important throughout the project. In some sites, the site coordinator played an important role in coaching and assisting the leadership of the policy team to provide effective task and process leadership, and in providing leadership directly in some circumstances.

During the site selection process, it is important to identify the potential leadership of the policy team and possible events that might lead to the inability or unavailability of the proposed leaders to serve. The experiences of the CJSP suggest that early changes in leadership, before a site is really able to get underway, will make it very difficult for a site to proceed. Of particular importance is identifying the sources of informal leadership in a site and creating mechanisms to assure that the formal and informal leaders are able to work effectively together. The leadership must have a clear sense of where the project is going and also be able to keep people at the table and talking to each other. The importance of providing leadership of the process must be stressed. Those policy teams whose formal leadership lacked effectiveness, either as task leader or as process leader, tended to flounder early in the project until effective leadership developed, either internally or through the involvement of the site coordinator.

Sources of Formal and Informal Leadership

In some sites, considerable ambiguity existed around formal and informal leadership roles and responsibilities. The specific roles and responsibilities of the chair persons of the policy teams, the local site contact persons, and the CEPP site coordinators were unclear. That the leadership responsibilities were spread out among numerous people and were not well defined exacerbated the problem. Moreover, the skill levels of the formal and informal leaders varied from person to person and across sites. Leadership training was not provided to members of the policy teams until over two years into the project.

Different criminal justice system agencies initiated the projects in the different CJSP sites, and in some sites the formal leadership role of the policy team also was assumed by the leaders of those agencies. In other sites, the role was assumed by someone else in the criminal justice system (e.g., a judge). The leadership role was shared in a few sites. In some sites one person served in the formal leadership capacity as chair of the policy team and another person served in an informal leadership capacity as professional staff support to the policy team and the local site contact with the NIC/CEPP consultant team. The informal leadership roles of the local site contacts included keeping the chair of the policy team informed about the project and communicating other project-related information from the site coordinators to the policy team chair.

Effective task and process leadership are critical in teams with a diverse membership such as the CJSP policy teams. Effective leadership is critical to assure that important tasks get done, goals and outcomes are achieved, momentum is built, interest and enthusiasm for the project is maintained, people feel a sense of accomplishment, viewpoints do not get lost, and team members do not become alienated and withdraw from active participation. Both the pace and achievements of the CJSP projects were affected greatly by the presence or absence of both types of leadership behaviors and practices. Where effective task and process leadership were insufficient or lacking, the policy team tended to drift and accomplish little between visits of the site coordinator or at their team meetings. Where the team lacked process leadership in developing the full participation of all the team members, some team members became alienated and either withdrew from the team or became passive participants on the team. Both situations tended to undermine the team's work.

Sources of Task Leadership

In the majority of the sites, the formal leader also took on the role of task leader. Policy team chairpersons were responsible for setting the agenda and running the meetings, distributing the meeting minutes, keeping policy team members informed about project activities, and working closely with the NIC and the CEPP consultant team. In some sites, the staff support person for the policy team took on task leadership roles, including organizing policy team meetings, setting meeting agendas, organizing

assessment activities, distributing meeting minutes, and the like. In one site, the local site contact person also drafted most of the written work products of the policy team.

Sources of Process Leadership

The policy team chairs in all the sites were placed in the position of having to provide process leadership. One reason process leadership was so important in all the sites is that the policy teams were made up of a wide range of criminal justice system stakeholders, some of whom necessarily interacted as adversaries in the criminal justice process and all of whom competed for limited resources. The sites did a good job in assembling policy teams that included all the key justice system leaders —judges, prosecuting attorneys, public defenders, corrections (probation/parole), law enforcement — as well as others who are external to, but who have a stake in the system (e.g., legislators, county commissioners, mayor, city council members, community service agency representatives, and public members). With this diverse composition, process leadership was necessary to keep the policy teams committed to and involved in the CJSP.

Some of the policy teams had difficulties because the chairperson of the team did not provide effective meeting facilitation in terms of keeping the team on track in its tasks (providing task leadership) and assuring that all team members participated and had their interests heard (providing collaborative/process leadership). The site coordinators were neither able nor expected to attend enough policy team meetings to

provide effective, continuing facilitation. At the same time, there was no training in facilitation provided to the policy team chairs.

In some of the sites, effective outside facilitation by the site coordinators was an important component of success. Facilitation took place through direct facilitation of meetings or through work behind the scenes setting agendas and advising and assisting individual team members. The facilitation by the site coordinators provided both task and process leadership. Some of the site coordinators and/or other members of the consultant team provided facilitation when they were on site but were limited in the number of site visits they could make. In other sites, the site coordinators played almost no facilitative role at all. Where the site coordinators did not facilitate meetings, the policy team chairs usually facilitated the meetings, with varying success. The lack of effective facilitation proved to be a major stumbling block in at least a couple of the sites. We believe that the site coordinators needed to play a greater role as facilitators, at least during the first year of the project. Part of that role should have been to provide training in facilitation to the policy team chairs, both directly and by example.

Both task and process leadership are a continuing need throughout the project to (1) ensure that tasks are completed, (2) keep all members of the policy team at the table and working together, and (3) marshal resources to implement changes. Of critical importance is maintaining continuity of purpose when changes in leadership occur. In the information gathering phase, the primary functions of leadership are to (1) assure that the various assessment tasks are completed in a timely fashion and result in usable

products (task leadership), and (2) maintain a climate of collaboration among all the individuals conducting different parts of the information gathering (process leadership). The leadership of the policy team must be clear on what data collection tasks are to be undertaken, who is responsible, what time frames are involved, and what products are to be produced. It is the responsibility of the leadership to marshal the resources for the assessment and obtain the cooperation of the individuals who will provide the information, including those in charge of any automated information systems.

A key role of leadership in the planning phase is to assure that effective facilitation is provided, either personally or by obtaining outside facilitation. Leadership may also be instrumental in keeping the policy team on track and patient during this phase, to avoid the temptation to jump to immediate action and problem solving on specific problems rather than taking a longer term view. Facilitation may come internally or from an outside facilitator, possibly the site coordinator. A couple of sites abandoned or bypassed the planning phase because they did not see the value in doing it or they felt they were running out of time on the project. In those sites, the policy teams decided to focus on action instead of planning. They focused on immediate problems and began developing and implementing recommendations for improving their system without the data or a long range strategic plan.

The Need for Task Leadership

In one site, the initial chairperson of the team provided process leadership but not strong formal task leadership. This resulted in good attention to inclusive, system-wide thinking and common goals, but little focus on action. Task leadership thus came primarily from the CEPP site coordinator. When a new chairperson took over, he provided the task leadership necessary to move the team forward. In one site where task leadership was shared, having high level professional staff support who could also provide task leadership was critical to both the pace and achievements of that site, as the chair of the policy team did not have the time to devote to the project that the staff person did.

Although it was not explicit, the task leadership was also shared with the NIC/CEPP site coordinators in most of the sites. Policy team leaders were dependent on the NIC/CEPP site coordinators and consultant team to advise them of next steps, help them organize and complete the assessment activities, and review the results of the assessments. The formal/informal task leaders in some sites did not have a good understanding of the overall project or know what the policy team should be doing and consequently waited for the NIC/CEPP consultant team to advise and direct them.

The Need for Process Leadership

Overall, process leadership varied substantially across the sites. Where it was exercised well, it was instrumental in helping policy teams work together effectively

and stay committed to the CJSP. One role of process leadership is to assure that all members of the policy team are involved in the work of the team. Our interviews suggest that in some sites not all of the policy team members felt equally involved or involved in a meaningful way. Some questioned their role on the team (e.g., law enforcement representatives) and others (e.g, public members) on occasion felt isolated and excluded from discussions and informal decision making that occurs naturally among criminal justice system leaders when they interact with one another as part of their day-to-day jobs.

Another role of process leadership is to help overcome turf issues and build trust among team members. Where process leadership was lacking, turf issues or other strife arose between members. This in turn affected the level of trust in those policy teams. In those sites, once process leadership developed, the policy teams were able to overcome turf issues as policy team members improved their ability to work together, explore and discuss system-wide problems and mutual concerns, and overcome institutional boundaries.

In some sites, there was strong task leadership on the policy team throughout the project but relatively little process leadership. Those teams focused on action and paid little attention to the manner in which they did their work together. As a result, some team members in one site largely withdrew from the work of the team. In another site, the policy team devoted an extensive amount of effort to creating a community services resource inventory. By concentrating almost solely on this task, however, the team

became distracted from and did not adequately address the real issues that it was formed to consider. Without strong process leadership, rivalry among policy team members simmered under the surface.

The Need for Local Leadership

In some sites, the local leaders initially were largely dependent on the CEPP site coordinators. The degree of direction each site received from the CEPP site coordinators, however, varied from site to site, and as a result, the CJSPs in many of the sites experienced significant delays during the first two years of the project. The level of activity between site visits by the NIC/CEPP consultant team was reportedly modest, and although the policy teams met regularly, they accomplished little and did not develop more collaborative ways of working together. They (1) failed to examine and/or improve the level of trust among team members; (2) were reluctant to discuss and work through their differences; and (3) did not secure alignment around a vision or shared purpose. These sites started moving forward only after effective local leadership developed.

Effects of Changes in Leadership

The formal task leadership roles changed in nearly half of the sites, for various reasons. While the transition from one formal task leader to another went relatively smoothly for most of the sites, some continuity and momentum in the projects were lost when the leadership role changed. That is, it took a while to designate a new formal task leader, it took additional time to bring a new formal leader up to date on the

project, and/or the priorities or the work of the policy teams changed under the direction of a different person. The site coordinators played an important role in maintaining continuity during those periods.

Effective leadership is critical for maintaining momentum. There were variations in the roles and effectiveness of the leadership in the various sites, and these variations accounted for differences in the ability of the sites to maintain momentum. By the end of the project, however, all sites succeeded in developing the necessary task and process leadership to keep policy team members involved and at the table, despite having experienced periods of frustration, skepticism, inactivity, lack of direction, and lack of an urgent crisis. Task and process leadership were instrumental in helping the policy teams (1) remain intact and focused on doing meaningful work; (2) deal openly with frustration and skepticism; (3) discuss differences openly; and (4) deal effectively with difficult and/or sensitive criminal justice system data.

Our observations about leadership in the sites suggest that the issue deserves early attention as the projects are getting started. Leadership training was not provided in any of the sites. The policy team must have effective task and process leadership, be able to maintain effective leadership when leaders change, and be able to educate new team members in the collaborative approach to policy making.

A CLEAR SENSE OF PROGRESS AND ACCOMPLISHMENT

Without exception, at the outset of the project the policy teams had very little understanding of what the steps were in the project. In all of our initial site visits we

found that policy team members were universally unable to describe what they were supposed to be doing in the project beyond the next meeting or two. Further, in every site the policy team members remained unclear as to the process of the CJSP right up to the post-assessment retreats 18-24 months into the project. There were no clear steps in the process for the policy teams to follow, no time frames set for accomplishing steps in the process, and no clear expectations as to the end products. Without a clear project plan to follow, some of the policy teams had difficulty maintaining momentum. One policy team began to cancel meetings for lack of anything to do, and others accomplished little unless the site coordinator was present to give them direction. As a result, even several years into the project:

- Policy team members were uncertain about what they needed to do or the next steps. Most sites went from one meeting to the next without knowing what was supposed to happen next.
- Policy team members did not know the timetable for completing various steps in the process. Consequently, some members lost interest in and/or became frustrated with the seemingly slow pace of the project and skeptical about the benefits of participating in the CJSP.
- Most policy team members were not able to clearly articulate the benefits that they expected from the project or what they would have at the end of the project.
- A few sites decided to act on their own rather than wait for the assessment results or other project work products.

All of the sites indicated that they would have liked to have had a clearer picture of the whole project at the beginning. This is critical to maintaining continuity from one meeting to the next and creating a sense of progress and things fitting together. One site indicated that they conducted a series of mini-tasks that did not tie together and did not lead to any continuity or progress. Further, several of the policy teams added that they would have liked a sense of the outcomes that they might hope to achieve at the beginning of the project. This might include some examples of what other sites have been able to achieve through a similar process. While a stated goal of the project was to have each site shape the planning process to its own particular problems and needs, the sites still needed some guidance in the form of options to consider, with some suggestions as to the advantages and disadvantages of different options and examples of how other jurisdictions have undertaken similar planning projects. As one site put it, “we would have liked a multiple choice test and not open-ended essays.” They added that leaving the process too open-ended resulted in the team members’ not doing anything to avoid looking ignorant. Further, they indicated that the planning jargon needs to be translated into concrete examples (e.g., what are “institutionalized collaborative planning and change processes”).

Having a larger project plan is critical to maintaining continuity between the steps in the project and between policy team meetings. The policy teams needed a clearly defined process at the start of the project, including goals and a path to achieve those goals. They then needed to continuously assess their progress against the larger

project plan, set the stage for the next steps in the project and document and celebrate their successes along the way. Without a clear project plan, most of the sites did not know what to do between site visits by the site coordinators. They lacked focus and direction and consequently remained relatively idle (or completed only small tasks) between site coordinator visits. Further, continuity between project activities and policy team meetings was lacking. Policy teams did not have a clear path for doing their work, and thus much of it seemed disjointed. They were not able to track their progress according to a predefined project plan or schedule, therefore, they did not routinely review or celebrate their progress or successes.

Part of creating a project plan is setting intermediate and ultimate project goals and milestones so that the policy team can assess its progress. In our first collaboration survey, the sites gave the lowest mean scores over all to: (1) setting concrete, measurable project goals and milestones; and (2) establishing methods for monitoring performance. Without measurable goals and milestones, some policy teams started to get discouraged about their apparent lack of progress. Part way through the project, the chair of one policy team in particular thought that the team had accomplished very little when in fact, at the time that he made the comment, the team had a substantial list of accomplishments. That site was still unable to articulate its successes at the final evaluation debriefing meeting nine months after the end of the project, despite the fact that the site had some important accomplishments.

Project or process outcomes or goals and mid-term milestones or interim goals need to be established early in the project, so that the policy teams have criteria on which to judge how well they are doing and accomplishments to celebrate or publicize to their internal and external stakeholders. The CJSP activities all required a substantial commitment of energy, time and resources from the sites. It can help the teams obtain resources if project goals and outcomes are defined initially, mid-term milestones identified, project products acknowledged and project milestones celebrated. The above also play a key role in helping to build and maintain momentum in a project of this magnitude and duration.

The policy teams need tools for monitoring their progress. Most of the policy teams did not produce written documents outlining their short term priorities, annual projects, or action steps for moving forward. They did not have any documentation of what team members agreed to do, what their annual priorities were, time lines or milestone measures, or who was responsible for the various activities. In short, they lacked a tool for monitoring progress, keeping policy team members focused, and holding each other accountable for performance and results. Communicating about progress in achieving goals and celebrating the completion of project assignments helps keep policy teams focused, encourages them to continue in their efforts, and allows teams to see progress in meeting their longer term goals and objectives. Sharing work results and outputs continuously — even if the work has run into obstacles — helps keep team members motivated and engaged in the process.

Pace is also important. To maintain momentum, the pace of the project needs to be fast enough — especially at the beginning of the project — to hold people's attention and interest, while still allowing enough time for people to “bump into each other,” to get to know each other. A balance must be struck between not pushing people faster than they are ready to move and letting things drag on so long that people get frustrated with the lack of progress and lose interest. All of the policy teams progressed slowly throughout the middle two-thirds of the project. Early on and continuing through the middle part of the project, the pace of project activities lagged as the sites waited for data and information about their system. All of the policy teams had difficulty gaining and maintaining momentum and feeling like they were making progress or accomplishing worthwhile things in the middle of the project.

The post-assessment retreats held in each site and the all-site leadership conference held in Washington, D.C. in February 1999 were mentioned by all the sites as critical catalysts to get the policy teams back on track. These meetings gave policy team members a chance to work together for a longer time (typically two full days), think more broadly about the issues, and evaluate their successes. They also provided an opportunity to introduce information on best practices to the policy team. Some of the sites finally established project goals at the all-site leadership conference. This was two years into the project. Some sites suggested that a retreat similar to the one held in each site two years into the project could be held at the beginning of the project as well.

To summarize, the lack of a clear project plan and a written record of goals and action steps in most sites made it difficult to monitor progress and celebrate successes. There must be continuing communication between the site coordinator and the policy team as to the progress of the policy team, where they have been, what they have accomplished, and where they are going, in order to maintain momentum. Communication of progress between the policy team and the broader community is also a critical need to garner support and resources for the policy team.

TIMELY AVAILABILITY OF GOOD INFORMATION

Promoting data-driven decision making was an important goal of the CJSP. Every site agreed with this goal, but no site had a capability or a mechanism to gather data systemically that could be used for policy making. As a result, data collection in all the CJSP sites turned out to be a much more difficult and time-consuming task than had been anticipated, and the resulting delays waiting for data analysis slowed the project substantially in some of the sites.

In the information gathering phase, the site coordinators, policy team members and data consultants must all work together to determine what information needs to be collected and how it will be used. The policy team must define its information needs based on the particular policy issues it wishes to address. Data collection methods for the offender profile data and the information to be collected in the assessment, including the questions to be asked, the sources of information, and the manner of presentation of the results, must be developed collaboratively. Failure to do this can

lead to misunderstanding and sometimes wasted effort collecting data that are not useful to the policy team. Further, technical assistance providers must work with the policy team to assure that they understand the needs and culture of the site and the ways in which the technical assistance will be used.

The Offender Population Data

The jail population data analysis was developed largely between the data consultant and the information systems people in the sites, with relatively little participation by or involvement of policy team members. The policy team members in most of the sites thus had little understanding of what went into the data collection. In at least one site, the policy team developed unrealistic expectations of the value of the offender population data analysis and came to believe that the data would provide answers to all their questions. That policy team essentially became paralyzed while waiting for the data. What was needed in most sites was an information inventory, created at the beginning of the project, to determine what information was needed and could be collected, how it would have to be collected, and the level of effort that would be required.

It appears to us from the data needs expressed by the policy team members across all the sites that there are some data elements of an offender profile and a jail population profile that should be collected in every site. It may be helpful to develop a generic blueprint for sites for collecting and analyzing these data (e.g., data elements and potential sources). The blueprint could be similar to the templates the CJSP

developed for collecting other information for the assessment (e.g., agency profiles). This approach would help uncover gaps in the availability of data, inconsistencies among agencies in how data elements are defined and presented, and the need for more integrated automated systems that would facilitate and support analysis of the data.

Each site also had some unique data needs depending on the site's priority strategic issues and the particular objectives to be achieved by the policy team in addressing those issues. As an example of targeted data collection, Jackson County had specific data needs to develop better criteria for determining whom to release from jail to meet the jail cap imposed by the Federal Court. The data consultant designed the data collection and analysis plan to address that issue, and the eventual data were of considerable use to the policy team.

The Assessment

The criminal justice system assessment was the single most extensive task in the CJSP. Yet in most sites, the policy team members had little understanding of what the assessment was, how it was to be developed and conducted, what it was to include and how it was to be used. The plans for the assessment, including the questions to be addressed, the information to be developed, and the methods for presenting the information to the policy team, were developed with relatively little or no input from the policy teams. As a result, the policy teams did not understand the scope of the assessment or the limitations of the information to be produced. All the sites completed an assessment, but the components were completed in different ways and the results

shared with the policy teams in different ways. Most of the components were completed by the individual policy teams with assistance, sometimes substantial, from the NIC/CEPP consultant team. The consultant team also conducted the “swoop” and were expected to prepare an assessment report for each site.

Each of the sites worked on a system process map. Generally, the maps depict how offenders move through the criminal justice system process. They may also include (1) caseflow information (i.e., the numbers of cases that proceed through each stage of the process) and (2) bottlenecks (e.g., where delay occurs, where additional resources may be needed, where caseflow information is missing). How the process maps were completed varied across sites. In some sites the policy teams completed them. In other sites, the task was assigned to a small work group outside the policy team, a subset of the policy team, or one or more staff who sought input from other staff in the justice system as needed.

The use made of the process maps varied by site. While some sites found very little value to the process map, others found it useful in a variety of ways. In Tulsa County the policy team used the process map to eliminate a pretrial hearing step that caused unnecessary delay. In the other sites, the approach used to prepare the maps reportedly was educational for those who participated in their development, and a few policy team members reported using the information from the map in their staff training. Further, in St. Lawrence County the map has been used as an educational tool by the League of Women Voters.

The other assessment tasks to be completed by the policy teams, including the sanctions and programs inventories, community resources inventory, agency profiles, and comparative analysis, were not completed by all the sites. For those sites that did complete those tasks, the processes varied considerably. A few sites assigned them to one individual to complete, with review by the whole policy team. Other sites assigned parts to various policy team members (or other agency staff) to complete. Typically the sites used the tools/templates provided by CEPP. The output from those efforts, such as the sanctions and programs inventories, community resources inventory, and agency profiles, reportedly were of limited utility to the policy team in most sites.

Overall, the assessment swoops took much longer to complete than originally contemplated by the NIC/CEPP consultant team. Although the CJSP sites were initially selected in late 1996 and site visits began in early 1997, the "swoops" did not take place until almost a year later. The first occurred in February 1998 and the last in November 1998. The model of having a group of consultants all descend on a jurisdiction at once caused some logistical problems, especially in Alaska, where the consultants were in different parts of the state and could not meet during the week to review what they were finding and integrate the information.

The resulting assessment reports required even more time to prepare. As a result, while some of the sites made use of the assessment results to define strategic or priority issues and set up work groups for future activity, other sites either moved ahead without waiting for the assessment results or did not make much use of them.

Three of the sites received written assessment reports, in late 1998 or early 1999, while four sites did not receive a final written report. Two sites agreed not to receive a full assessment report, one requested a report but did not receive it, and one received a draft that they returned with suggested corrections but never received a corrected final version. All of the sites, however, received some information from the assessment. Below we discuss a few alternative approaches used to present the findings from the assessment to the policy teams.

Completion of Written Assessment Report and Presentation of Results at Retreat

In Jackson County, a draft of the full assessment report was prepared by the CEPP team and presented to selected members of the policy team for review in October 1998. The draft was reviewed by the site coordinator and a small committee from the policy team in January 1999 before it was put into final form. There was a jail population profile in the assessment report. The final assessment report, along with a project progress report, was released at a press conference on April 7, 1999. The findings from the assessment were presented to the policy team at the post-assessment retreat held in October 1998 and served as the basis of the discussion at the retreat. In addition, there was some data analysis presented at the retreat that provided a good illustration of how important data can be used in establishing jail release policies, but this analysis was not included the assessment report.

Presentation of Results Without Written Report

In Tulsa County, the results of the assessment were presented to the policy team verbally in a post-assessment retreat held in January 1999. The policy team initially requested a full written report, but later several of the policy team members indicated to the site coordinator that a full written report would not be necessary. As a result, no written report was prepared. A preliminary report on the jail population data analysis was also presented at the retreat. The three issues that the policy team decided to pursue after the retreat — juvenile issues, the issue of over-representation of minorities in the jail and the issue of court delay — all emerged from assessment findings presented at the retreat.

There was a conscious decision *not* to document the assessment findings in a formal report to the policy teams in Dutchess and St. Lawrence Counties. Instead, the site coordinator agreed to prepare written summaries of assessment findings if and when they were relevant to the work of the policy team. Dutchess County eventually received some reports, which eventually were distributed to policy team members as part of a notebook. They have been useful in a few instances. In St. Lawrence County, the summary papers were prepared, but they were not distributed to the members of the policy team for two reasons: (1) the information was obsolete by the time the reports were prepared; and (2) the policy team had moved on to other matters. Some of the assessment findings were presented to the policy teams in handouts and verbally at a joint retreat held in November 1998. Not all the policy team members from Dutchess

County attended that retreat, however. They had to rely on those who did attend the retreat sharing the assessment findings informally after the retreat. There was a second retreat held in February 1999, but no assessment findings were presented. We see at least five problems with this approach.

- First, the assessment report was supposed to be the foundation for the strategic planning phase of the CJSP. A major value of the assessment — at least in the opinion of policy team members we interviewed — was that outside experts were examining the system and providing their perspective on the critical issues facing the system. These issues, captured in the assessment report, would then help the policy team identify priority areas for attention as it began its strategic planning efforts. Without a report, the site may not obtain the benefit of outside expert opinions about the challenges facing the system.
- Second, there is no guarantee that all the assessment findings will ever be revealed in the targeted written summaries if the policy team's strategic issues do not match the issues covered in the assessment.
- Third, if the assessment findings are only shared with an individual or work group, the entire policy team will not have a shared understanding of the findings unless the work group happens to bring them to the full team's attention.
- Fourth, there is no formal body of knowledge to use as a reference as the policy team identifies its strategic issues and develops action plans. Moreover, as leaders and

hence team members change, there is no historical record that provides a picture of the county at the time the assessment was conducted.

- Fifth, the absence of a document leaves no output for the policy team to point to as an accomplishment of the team. We heard comments from a couple team members that materials they had sent to the site coordinator for inclusion in the assessment report were never acknowledged and never shared with the policy team. The hard work of the group in researching and preparing a report needs to be acknowledged for people to remain engaged and involved in the CJSP.

In some sites, the CJSP helped provide targeted technical assistance, including bringing in research on best practices and the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to the problems identified by the site. This was provided by the site coordinators in some sites and outside experts in others. The assistance also included team building assistance in one site. Technical assistance had to be provided carefully, however. In two sites, studies conducted early in the project by outside consultants caused so much dissension that they nearly killed the project.

Overall, communication in the information gathering phase among the site coordinators, the team leadership and the policy team members is important to assure that the policy team members all are kept informed of the progress of the information gathering tasks and understand how the information gathering exercises relate to the larger goal of creating better system-wide sanctioning policy, so that the exercises do not become merely ends in themselves. Further, consultants involved in the

information gathering must communicate the results in a form that can be used by the policy team, both internally and to present to the broader community.

In thinking about replicating the CJSP in other sites, we believe the way in which the assessment was conducted and used and the timing of the assessment activities needs to be reconsidered. It was expensive, time consuming and did not produce useful or timely information in some of the sites. Some sites suggested that the assessment should be done by the policy team, with the help of perhaps one or two outside knowledgeable consultants. The crowd approach to the "swoop" resulted in too many different styles that had to be coordinated and integrated.

BUILDING LOCAL CAPACITY AND SUPPORT

A critical issue for leadership of the policy teams and for the site coordinators was building the capacity for the site to continue the work of the policy team after the project ends and the facilitators leave. Building this capacity includes both: (1) providing the sites with tools to create change; and (2) creating support for change. Learning how to ask the right questions and having tools for analyzing problems is critical for creating a sustainable capacity to continue the work of the policy team. In several sites the policy teams were provided the ability to develop and use such tools as a process map, the LSI, and other offender assessment tools. The project should also provide sites with the ability to compare themselves to other sites, to determine the promise and limitations of solutions developed elsewhere to address local problems. The sites need to be able to develop local solutions to local problems.

The sites need the capacity to conduct their own data collection and analysis on a continuing basis in order to develop policy based on information and evaluate the effects of new sanctioning programs that are instituted. This includes being able to define measurable outcomes for new programs, anticipate the data that will be needed to measure the outcomes, build data development and collection into new programs, and collect and analyze the data. In one site, data collection assistance provided through the project included training of staff to continue the work on the data. This assistance has proven to be more time consuming than originally thought, and the site has obtained additional outside funding to obtain further assistance from the CJSP data consultant. Where periodic technical advice may be needed, the sites should be encouraged to build funds into their justice system budget to pay for such assistance without outside funding, if necessary.

Working collaboratively was another important skill for building capacity. In most of the sites, the project left the sites with techniques to promote collaboration, including methods for: (1) maintaining an effective, broad-based membership on the policy team; (2) creating proper ground rules and team structure; (3) setting and monitoring goals and celebrating successes; (4) obtaining adequate resources to do the work; (5) encouraging collaborative work habits, including openness of discussions; (6) maintaining a continuing commitment to common goals and (7) seeking to place group goals above individual agency goals.

Having a vision for the criminal justice system is a critical part of capacity building. A vision provides a desired future toward which to strive. Having a collective vision assures that everyone on the team is striving toward the same desired future. It is thus critical to promoting collaboration. Considering the mission and vision early in the project is important, as the mission and vision can also provide guidance as to the desired composition of the policy team. As with a mission and vision, identifying strategic issues early in the assessment process is important so that the policy team begins thinking about long term issues rather than just focusing on and being trapped by the most immediate problems occupying people's attention. Strategic issues are internal or external issues that are fundamentally important to the organization or system. They are often the underlying or more encompassing issues of what appear to be numerous unrelated or loosely related short term problems. They focus on general directions rather than specific operations. The teams should be encouraged to identify their strategic issues so that they can effectively address fundamental issues that will likely block their ability to move toward their vision and accomplish their long term goals.

Each of the sites began discussing a vision for their criminal justice system and some goals at the post-assessment planning retreat. Some of the sites completed their vision statements either at the retreats or at later meetings, but reportedly few have actually used them in their ongoing work. All of the sites believed that the post-

assessment planning retreats were very effective in helping the policy teams gain focus and determine what they were going to work on for the rest of the project.

Ideally, the project should produce a written plan, to serve as a means of communicating the vision of the system to new policy team members and the broader community and to create a record to which the policy team can refer as it turns to action planning and implementation. While a couple of the sites have goals and short term action plans for making improvements to their criminal justice system, none of the sites completed a comprehensive, long range strategic planning process, and none have a written 2-3 year strategic plan. Consequently, none of the sites has:

- Written, long range strategic plans for improving their criminal justice systems;
- Long range goals for their system;
- Performance measures or targeted outcomes from which to measure their progress or assess their performance or results;
- Comprehensive strategies for achieving specific targets or goals or dealing with criminal justice system issues.

Building Support

Maintaining the effectiveness of the policy team requires understanding and confidence in the work of the policy team by local elected officials and the public. This requires communication between the policy team and the public. Communication between the policy team and the broader community was largely lacking in most of the sites. Open meeting laws affected some of the policy teams, but only one policy team

published its meeting times in the newspaper and attracted non-members to its meetings.

One communication issue involves the role of the policy team vis-a-vis other groups addressing justice system issues. For example, some of the policy teams in the sites were actually committees of larger groups. In Jackson County, the policy team was the Adult Subcommittee of the Public Safety Coordinating Council and in Maricopa County the policy team was a subset of executives who were members of the Maricopa County Justice Coordinating Committee (McJustice). Also, several policy teams formed small work groups around specific issue areas. Assuring good communication between the policy teams and the larger committees and between the policy teams and their work groups, has been — and is likely to continue to be — challenging unless extra effort is devoted to it. It is important to establish formal and informal communication mechanisms and practices and discuss communication expectations explicitly, so that everyone is kept informed about the recommendations and activities in the various groups. In short, effective communication is imperative to (1) coordinate system-wide improvement efforts and (2) evaluate the effects of the changes.

A couple of the sites have attempted to communicate with the broader public through a variety of methods. Those methods include (1) having elected officials and representatives of the public as members of the policy team, (2) televising policy team meetings on local public access cable stations, (3) presenting public education forums,

and (4) surveying public opinion on criminal justice topics. The policy team in one site established a work group whose charge was to develop better ways of communicating with the broader community. Its first task was to develop and administer a public opinion survey on criminal justice system issues. Another site has held public forums on the issue of over-representation of minority defendants in the justice system. We believe it would be useful to all sites to learn (1) how the stakeholders/community members feel about such issues as releasing certain types of offenders back into the community, (2) what opinions they have about sanctions for certain types of offenses, and (3) how they would rank alternative goals of the criminal justice system (e.g., rehabilitation, punishment/retribution, public safety). A state level policy team has some special concerns with regard to building public support for reforms, particularly where state funding or statutory change is required. First, state legislatures meet only sporadically, unlike county boards, which typically meet monthly. This may cause delay between the time that reforms are recommended by the policy team and the time when they are finally considered by the legislature. Further, there may be extensive preparation required before a proposal actually reaches the floor of the legislature, including technical drafting, obtaining a sponsor and identifying budget implications. In addition, public support for reforms will have to be built statewide.

SECTION V

CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL JUSTICE SYSTEM PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

This section discusses the critical elements for the collaborative justice system planning, based on the findings of the evaluation. It presents our recommendations for starting up and sustaining momentum in a project of the CJSP's scope and breadth. In the following discussion our recommendations are grouped into five phases: (1) site selection phase; (2) start-up phase; (3) information gathering phase; (4) planning phase; and (5) implementation of changes phase.

SITE SELECTION PHASE

Selecting the sites for a project such as the CJSP is a critical part of the project. If a site is to succeed in a project like the CJSP, the criminal justice leaders must have a clear perception of the need for the project, understand what will be expected of them, and be willing to commit the necessary resources to complete the work of the project. The proposal solicitation must be written to clearly and in detail describe what the project will entail.

Policy team members must perceive a pressing enough need to command the time and attention of the policy team members, while still being open to identifying new issues to address. They must understand what the project will entail, including the

tasks and activities in the project, the expected time frames of the project, and the ways in which each member will be expected to participate. They must be willing to commit adequate resources to the project, including the time of the policy team members, adequate staff support for the policy team, time required of agency line staff to produce information and other work products, and other resources to complete project activities (such as people to collect data). Ideally, the selection team should try to meet with all key individuals in a group, rather than individually, and should be ready to present a clear picture of what will be done in the project, including time frames.

We believe that the following are critical to the pre-selection site visit:

- Reiterate the espoused values of a process of this nature, the approach and likely activities, and the expectations of the sites and individuals on the policy teams;
- Assess the level of other activities going on in the site (e.g., other projects, elections) to determine if the criminal justice system leaders have the time to commit to this project;
- Assess the degree of urgency (and enthusiasm) for addressing the various criminal justice system issues the site outlined in its application;
- Look for examples of past activities and practices that are consistent with the espoused values of the CJSP (e.g., assess the climate of collaboration in the site);
- If a site has an existing policy team, observe a meeting to see how members interact with one another, how they address issues, how they make decisions, etc.;

-
- Assess the site's ability to gather relevant data and policy team members' willingness to re-define the nature of the problem if the data do not support their preconceived notion of the problem(s);
 - Determine if policy team members are open to exploring a range of viable solutions to their problems or issues; and
 - Inquire about site politics or other things that might impede the site's ability to do this type of work (e.g., identify threats and impediments).

Below are recommendations for the site selection phase to assist NIC in evaluating the sites' readiness to engage in this type of work.

Recommendations For the Site Selection Phase

<i>Recommendation 1</i>	<p><u>Describe the process and approach fully in the Request for Proposal.</u> Describe the phases or elements of the process as well as some of the likely tasks or activities of the policy team. Define the expectations of the sites and Policy team members and lay out the inherent values of doing systems work.</p>
<i>Recommendation 2</i>	<p><u>Ask sites to explain in their applications why they believe they can be successful at working collaboratively to make system-wide improvements.</u> Look for local conditions that will support their efforts, examples of successes in the past, or indications of the site's interest in learning a new approach to working together to make criminal justice system improvements.</p>
<i>Recommendation 3</i>	<p>Ask sites to clarify the authority (or anticipated authority) of the policy team in their jurisdiction. Determine if the policy team will be a decision making or recommending body. Wherever possible, encourage the policy team to be officially sanctioned as the entity to make decisions for and improvements to the criminal justice system.</p>
<i>Recommendation 4</i>	<p><u>Ask sites to give examples of system-wide issues they would like to address through a project of this nature (rather than identifying the single problem they want to address).</u> This is intended to keep sites open to identifying problems as part of the process rather than believing the problem is already defined, and thus, wanting to move immediately to finding solutions for their predetermined problem.</p>
<i>Recommendation 5</i>	<p><u>Ensure that the people who will be involved in the project perceive a need for the project and understand what will be expected of them.</u></p>

START-UP PHASE

With the length and complexity of a comprehensive collaborative planning effort, it is critical at the outset to assure that the structure is in place to allow the project to succeed. This includes establishing: (1) the authority of the policy team, (2) proper membership and commitment of the policy team; (3) adequate resources for the policy team, and (4) a climate that will enable collaboration. Attention to these details at the beginning of the project will facilitate maintaining momentum as the project progresses. Our recommendations for the initial phase are organized into two categories: (1) formation of the policy team and (2) start-up activities.

FORMATION OF THE POLICY TEAM

It is important for a policy team in a project of this nature to be officially recognized and have the authority to make decisions for the criminal justice system. The recognition and authority may come from the state legislature or from a local governing body such as a county commission. It may also come *de facto* from having all the key justice system leaders at the table. The lack of formal recognition and authority can derail even the most well-planned effort.

One way of assuring that the policy team has authority is to have the policy team include all of the key criminal justice leaders in the jurisdiction, including leaders from the judiciary, court administration, law enforcement, prosecution, defense, probation, corrections and social services. Ideally, the top leadership will serve on the team (e.g. the sheriff, the district attorney) and will attend in person rather than sending deputies

to attend as seconds. Elected officials, such as county commissioners, should also be considered for membership. We believe that citizen members should also be included, with time taken to provide them with proper education.

We believe that the ideal size of a policy team is 8-15 members. Larger teams may have difficulty making policy decisions and promoting collaboration among team members. On the other hand, larger teams may allow for broader participation and more inclusivity. One way to work with a larger team is to create a smaller executive committee and working subcommittees from among the team members and let the subcommittees make decisions about the project's direction and activities. If this approach is taken, it is important for subcommittees to report to the policy team as a whole at regular intervals.

Below are recommendations with regard to the formation of the policy team.

Recommendations For the Formation of the Policy Team	
<i>Recommendation 6</i>	<u>Assure that the policy team has the membership necessary to create effective, system-wide criminal justice policy, including all top criminal justice system agency heads, human service and treatment leaders, and other key decision makers such as county commissioners or county executives.</u> NIC should work with key criminal justice leaders to create the appropriate membership for the policy team in each site.

Recommendations For the Formation of the Policy Team

<i>Recommendation 7</i>	<u>Strongly encourage each site to seriously consider having a community member on the policy team.</u> NIC should help policy teams weigh the benefits and drawbacks to having community members involved on the policy teams and should help them make the best decision for their jurisdiction. If community members are included on the policy team, develop a plan for integrating them into the policy team, educating them about the justice system, and ensuring that their contributions and ideas are meaningful and valuable to the entire policy team.
<i>Recommendation 8</i>	<u>Clarify the decision making authority of the policy team.</u> Preferably ensure that the policy team is officially recognized and authorized to make policy decisions for the criminal justice system. If the policy team is a recommending body, assure that the policy team involves people who are in a decision making role or who can significantly influence those who will be making the decisions.
<i>Recommendation 9</i>	<u>Ensure that the policy team is a manageable size and/or structured in a manner that will help it work together effectively and achieve results.</u> We recommend that the size of policy teams be between 8 and 15 people. If the size exceeds 15 people, we recommend the use of a structure such as subcommittees or work groups to do specific work.

START-UP ACTIVITIES

The beginning of a planning project such as the CJSP is a critical time. Initial project activities must be designed to assure that policy team members have: (1) a clear picture of the steps in the project and the expected interim and final outcomes of the project, (2) guidelines to govern how the policy team members will interact and make decisions, and (3) clear role definitions, including leadership. The roles of outside facilitators also need to be defined.

The policy teams need to have a clear picture of the whole project at the

beginning. That is, they need to know (1) the steps in and elements of the process, (2) what time frames are reasonable for completing those steps, (3) how the steps will contribute to the final outcomes, and (4) what roles the policy team members and the facilitation team will play and thus what resources the site will likely need at each step to fulfill its role. Even if a goal is to have each site shape the planning process to its own particular problems and needs, the sites need some guidance in the form of options to consider, with some suggestions as to the advantages and disadvantages of different options and examples of how other jurisdictions have undertaken similar planning projects. Project or process outcomes or goals and mid-term milestones or interim goals also need to be established early in the project.

A critical goal of the project is to encourage collaboration and system-wide thinking. Collaboration and systems thinking need to be taught. System-wide thinking requires that agencies look beyond their own needs and consider the effects of their actions on other agencies. This will take time, especially in a system where agencies have competing roles and missions, where politics may frustrate interagency cooperation and the search for long term solutions to problems, and where power is often defined by an agency's share of resources. Also, if a decision that affects the larger justice system can be made by a single agency (e.g., charging decisions), it is sometimes difficult to take the time necessary to consult with other agencies, attempt to analyze potential side effects of decisions, and seek joint decisions. The benefits of a system-

wide approach may not be obvious to an agency faced with the pressure of daily problems.

Collaboration means "to work together." It goes beyond communication, cooperation, coordination, stakeholder involvement, and citizen input. Collaboration is a process where diverse parties with differing and oftentimes competing interests, come together and form a mutually beneficial relationship to work toward a common goal and/or solve a mutual problem. When truly collaborating, individual agendas, group identities and loyalties, and organizational and institutional boundaries are set aside and overcome. Collaboration may involve sharing information and resources, creating joint working teams, and a variety of other means of working together.

The sites also need to know at the beginning what resources will be required and what the project funding will and will not be able to provide. Staff support is critical for arranging meeting logistics, producing useful minutes of team meetings, obtaining information and other resources for the team when necessary, arranging the schedules for site coordinator meetings, preparing drafts of written products, and other tasks. Teams need some structure to function effectively. Ground rules, roles for team members and decision making methods need to be set early on, before unproductive behaviors become the norm or in order to get members to work together differently than they have in the past. Ground rules help make explicit the expectations the team has of individual members, such as being open to all views, a willingness to put everything on the table and refrain from having hidden agendas, and decisions about

other issues involving mutual trust. The discussion of roles and responsibilities should include the team's expectations of members for attending meetings, for completing selected tasks, and for committing time to the work required.

Effective task and process leadership are critical in teams with a diverse membership such as the CJSP policy teams. Effective leadership is critical to assure that important tasks get done, goals and outcomes are achieved, momentum is built, interest and enthusiasm for the project is maintained, people feel a sense of accomplishment, viewpoints do not get lost, and team members do not become alienated and withdraw from active participation. In addition, at least some informal training in collaborative leadership should be provided in every site.

Finally, effective outside facilitation can be critical to the success of the CJSP. Effective facilitation can take place either through facilitation of meetings or through work behind the scenes setting agendas and advising and assisting individual team members. Facilitation can provide task or process leadership. The project should be structured so that outside facilitators play a substantial role during the first year of the project. Part of that role should be to provide training in facilitation to the policy team chairs, both directly and by example. As the project progresses, the policy team chair should assume more of the facilitation, with the ultimate goal of eventually eliminating the need for outside facilitation. Assisting sites in dealing with changes in leadership should be another role of the site coordinators.

Below are recommendations with regard to the start-up activities of the CJSP.

Recommendations For Start-Up Activities	
<i>Recommendation 10</i>	<u>Minimize the elapsed time between site selection and the start of the project.</u> Seize early enthusiasm and momentum by starting up the projects within 4 to 6 weeks of selecting the sites.
<i>Recommendation 11</i>	<u>Orient the formal and informal leaders of the policy team to the project.</u> Explain the need to collaborate and think system-wide, map out an approach that meets the needs and interests of the jurisdiction, and jointly customize the process to the jurisdiction.
<i>Recommendation 12</i>	<u>Assure that the policy team leaders understand the need for both task and process leadership.</u> Explain the importance of having both task and process leadership for an effective team. Provide leadership training as needed.
<i>Recommendation 13</i>	<u>Orient all policy team members to the project early on, including (a) ensuring that they have a clear understanding of what they will be doing and the outcomes they are striving for and (b) ensuring that they are committed to the process and approach as described.</u> Explain the approach, the process, what it will take to succeed at this type of work, the likely benefits to be gained, and what is expected of everyone and the site. Establish agreed upon ground rules for working together, agree on a meeting and project schedule, and identify expected project outcomes, goals, and mid-term milestones early in the project. Train everyone on collaboration principles and practices.

Recommendations For Start-Up Activities	
<i>Recommendation 14</i>	<u>Teach members of the policy teams about collaboration and systems thinking.</u> Teach members of the policy teams about the importance of taking a system-wide view of problems, to take into account how the actions of one agency can affect the work of other agencies. Assure that they understand how collaboration goes beyond cooperation.
<i>Recommendation 15</i>	<u>Assess the support needs of the policy teams up front and ensure that they have the professional and administrative staff support and resources needed to coordinate project activities.</u> For example, as needed assign a person to support the policy team and determine what other professional assistance the team is in need of. Clearly define the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the professional and administrative staff. Recommended administrative support duties include preparing and disseminating agendas and pre-meeting materials, arranging meeting logistics, summarizing and distributing meeting minutes, monitoring work group activities and the like.
<i>Recommendation 16</i>	<u>Define the roles and responsibilities of key people involved in the project.</u> Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the site coordinator, the local site contact person, and the formal leader of the policy team. Explain the importance of having agency heads and not deputies or seconds attend policy team meetings. Take steps to ensure that each policy team receives a consistent and adequate level of support to complete its work.
<i>Recommendation 17</i>	<u>Assure an adequate level of presence by the site coordinator to provide effective facilitation for the policy team.</u> At least during the first year of the project, substantial outside facilitation is likely to be necessary, to help the policy teams conduct the assessment and develop a long term plan, and to educate the policy teams on collaborative planning.

INFORMATION GATHERING PHASE

Promoting data-driven decision making was an important goal of the CJSP. An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the criminal justice system in each site is a critical part of the project. The assessment may be done by the Policy team or may

require the help outside consultants. The assessment in each site should be summarized in a written report.

An information inventory should be created at the beginning of the project, to determine what information is needed and can be collected, how it will have to be collected and the level of effort that will be required. There are some data that should be collected in all sites, such as elements of an offender profile and a jail population profile. It may be helpful to develop a generic blueprint for sites for collecting and analyzing these data. Each site will also have specific data needs depending on the site's priority strategic issues and the particular objectives to be achieved by the policy team in addressing those issues. In addition, data collection should reflect the criminal justice process in the jurisdiction and be tied to the process mapping, with the mapping specifying the points at which decisions regarding sanctions for an offender might be made and the data providing profiles of offenders receiving different sanctions at each decision point.

An assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the criminal justice system in each site is a critical part of the project. The assessment should be conducted primarily by the policy team, although it may be useful to involve the help of perhaps one or two outside knowledgeable consultants, as outside consultants can sometimes ask questions that an insider may not be comfortable asking. We do not advise the use of a large team of outside consultants to conduct the assessment, as it can result in too many different styles that have to be coordinated and integrated. Part of the assessment should be to

describe how the laws affect the flow of offenders. The information from the assessment should be compiled quickly after the activities are completed and organized into a written report, to assure that all policy team members are provided with all the information collected in a timely fashion for decision making purposes.

Recommendations For the Information Gathering Phase	
<i>Recommendation 18</i>	<u>Help sites develop a comprehensive data collection plan, including a matrix of data needs and data sources, before beginning the information and data gathering processes.</u> Determine what information and data are needed to better understand the system, define what questions the policy team is attempting to answer, assess what data are available, determine the best approach for gathering the information and data, etc. Ensure there is a clear purpose for completing the assessment tasks (e.g., process map, community services inventory) as well as gathering jail population and other assessment data.
<i>Recommendation 19</i>	<u>Provide sites with a generic blueprint and other helpful tools such as templates and methods for collecting and analyzing local information.</u>
<i>Recommendation 20</i>	<u>If outside consultants are needed, involve the teams actively in planning for and coordinating the activities of the external consultants.</u> Gather the information systematically and synthesize the collective results and findings.
<i>Recommendation 21</i>	<u>Share the information, data, and findings from all assessment activities soon after the activities are completed.</u>
<i>Recommendation 22</i>	<u>Present the assessment information, data, and findings in a written report or summary so that all policy team members have access to and see the same information.</u> This helps all policy team members form a common understanding - or picture - of their criminal justice system.
<i>Recommendation 23</i>	<u>Provide targeted technical assistance such as data and statistical assistance, team building, presentations on best practices, and jail studies where there is a defined need.</u> Take steps to ensure that the technical assistance provided is helpful to the site.

There also has to be a element of "what works" and best practices, some ideas of what solutions are out there, how much they cost and what the advantages and disadvantages are of different approaches to the problems identified by the site.

Below are recommendations for the information gathering phase of the CJSP.

PLANNING PHASE

A major goal of the CJSP was to assist sites in developing a strategic plan setting forth a road map for making justice system improvements in the future. Having a vision for the criminal justice system provides a desired future toward which to strive. Having a collective vision assures that everyone on the team is striving toward the same desired future.

As with a mission and vision, identifying strategic issues is important so that the policy team begins thinking about long term issues rather than just focusing on the most immediate problems occupying people's attention. Strategic issues are the underlying or more encompassing issues of what appear to be numerous unrelated or loosely related short term problems. They focus on general directions rather than specific operations. The teams should be encouraged to identify their strategic issues so that they can effectively address fundamental issues that will likely block their ability to move toward their vision and accomplish their long term goals. Ideally, the project should be able to develop a mission, vision, system assessment, strategies and goals in no more than one year.

The outcome of the planning phase should be a written plan that describes the collective vision of the site, the strategic issues and the long range objectives, and action plans for the initial stapes to be taken to implement the plan. Creating a written document is important both to assure that all policy team members agree on the long term plan and to create a record for historical purposes as the plan is modified over time. The long term plan and more immediate action plans should then be reviewed at least annually.

Strategic thinking needs to be taught, as it involves a different paradigm from the day-to-day problem solving that tends to dominate the energy of criminal justice system actors. Strategic thinking requires looking at underlying causes, interactions among agencies, time frames that extend beyond immediate problems, and desired futures. It requires looking for common causes of seemingly unrelated problems and long term rather than immediate payoffs. This can be frustrating to busy people facing problems that demand immediate solutions. Unless the participants in the process are helped to understand what the end results of the strategic planning process will look like and how those results will benefit the system, they will naturally drift toward consideration of more immediate problems.

Below are recommendations for the planning phase of the CJSP.

Recommendations For the Planning Phase	
<i>Recommendation 24</i>	<u>Teach members of the policy teams about strategic planning, including the importance of strategic planning, the benefits to be gained, how to engage in a planning process, and how to develop a long range plan.</u> Help policy teams understand the importance of collectively developing (a) agreed upon values for the criminal justice system (e.g., guiding principles); (b) a common long term vision for the system; (c) one to five year goals for the system; and (d) short and long term strategies for improving the system. Assist the teams as needed in the planning process.
<i>Recommendation 25</i>	<u>Encourage the members of the policy teams to focus on the long term strategic issues and strategies for addressing those issues, rather than just on short term problems.</u>
<i>Recommendation 26</i>	<u>Encourage teams to have a written document that summarizes their future direction, goals, and strategies.</u>
<i>Recommendation 27</i>	<u>Help the sites prepare to operationalize or implement their plan.</u> Provide them with a variety of tools (e.g., action plans) and methods for following through on their plans and for revising their plans at least annually. And, help them establish first year priorities and complete action plans.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGES PHASE

Our recommendations for the elements of the implementation of changes phase are organized into two categories: (1) maintaining momentum and (2) creating the capacity to implement change.

MAINTAINING MOMENTUM

Maintaining momentum is likely to be a major challenge for an extensive project such as the CJSP. It is difficult to sustain a process and keep leaders engaged when the process is lengthy. There are some proven techniques we believe would be useful for the CJSP to embrace to create a high level of focus on, commitment to, and enthusiasm for the project. The policy teams need to set goals, establish performance measures, monitor progress and performance relative to the goals and measures, and celebrate successes. Then the policy teams must hold themselves responsible for achieving short and long range goals.

Having a larger project plan is critical to maintaining continuity between the steps in the project and between policy team meetings. The policy teams need a clearly defined process at the start of the project that includes goals and a path to achieve those goals. They then need to be kept updated about their progress on a routine basis (e.g., once a month) and have work assignments between meetings. The project needs to produce products for the sites, to show progress and to set the stage for the next steps in the project. There have to be some successes as the project proceeds, and these need to be documented to remind the sites of what they have accomplished. Further, as the project proceeds, it may be useful for the policy teams to know what the other project sites are doing, so they can assess their progress and get ideas on how to move forward more effectively.

Communication about progress in achieving goals and celebrating the completion of project assignments helps keep policy teams focused, encourages them to continue in their efforts, and allows teams to see progress in meeting their longer term goals and objectives. Sharing work results and outputs continuously – even if the work has run into obstacles – helps keep team members motivated and engaged in the process.

The pace of the project needs to be fast enough, especially at the outset, to hold people's attention and interest. At the same time, it may be necessary for people to have time to get to know each other, at least at the beginning of the project. A balance must be struck between not pushing people faster than they are ready to move and letting things drag on so slowly that people get frustrated with the lack of progress and lose interest.

Then throughout the project, the project needs some catalysts. Periodic retreats can give policy team members a chance to work together for a longer time and think more broadly about the issues. They can also provide an opportunity to bring information on best practices to the policy team. Further, the sites need a process to bring in new people and get them up to speed when people on the policy team change. Below are recommendations for maintaining momentum throughout the CJSP.

Recommendations For Maintaining Momentum	
<i>Recommendation 28</i>	<u>Maintain a reasonable pace of activities throughout the project.</u> Avoid prolonged periods of inactivity.
<i>Recommendation 29</i>	<u>Foster continuity from one meeting to the next by reminding policy team members of where they are in the process.</u> In particular, continually show them where they are in the process, both what they have accomplished to date and what is coming up. Continually communicate the rationale for the various parts of the process they designed for their jurisdiction.
<i>Recommendation 30</i>	<u>Using the policy team's agreed-upon process and written plan, review the team's progress periodically and celebrate progress, the achievement of interim goals/ milestones, and outcomes or accomplishments.</u> Modify the process and the written plans as needed.
<i>Recommendation 31</i>	<u>Hold periodic retreats away from the site, where policy team members can work together without the distractions of daily office pressures.</u>
<i>Recommendation 32</i>	<u>Periodically assess how well the team is working together, whether the team is doing meaningful and productive things, and whether it is accomplishing what it intended to accomplish.</u> Take steps to improve in these areas if necessary.

CREATING THE CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT CHANGE

A critical issue for the CJSP is building the capacity for the site to continue the work of the policy team after the project ends and the facilitators leave. Learning how to ask the right questions and having tools for analyzing problems is critical for creating a sustainable capacity to continue the work of the policy team. Policy teams need the ability to develop and use such tools as a process map, the LSI and other offender

assessment tools. The project should also provide sites with the ability to compare themselves to other sites, to determine the promise and limitations of solutions developed elsewhere to address local problems. The sites need to be able to develop local solutions to local problems.

The sites need the capacity to conduct their own data collection and analysis on a continuing basis in order to develop policy based on information and to evaluate the effects of new sanctioning programs that are instituted. This includes being able to define measurable outcomes for new programs, anticipate the data that will be needed to measure the outcomes, build data development and collection into new programs, and collect and analyze the data. Data collection assistance provided through the project should include training of staff to continue the work on the data, where possible. Where periodic technical advice may be needed, the sites should be encouraged to build funds into their justice system budget to pay for such assistance without outside funding, if necessary.

The project should leave the sites with techniques to promote collaboration, including methods for: (1) maintaining an effective, broad-based membership on the policy team; (2) creating proper ground rules and team structure; (3) setting and monitoring goals and celebrating successes; (4) obtaining adequate resources to do the work; (5) encouraging collaborative work habits, including openness of discussions; (6) maintaining a continuing commitment to common goals and (7) seeking to place group goals above individual agency goals. The policy team must have effective task and

process leadership, be able to maintain effective leadership when leaders change, and be able to educate new team members in the collaborative approach to policy making. The teams should also be provided ideas for possible agendas at annual retreats.

Maintaining the effectiveness of the policy team also requires understanding of and confidence in the work of the policy team by the public and local elected officials. This requires communication between the policy team and the public. A variety of methods may be used to effect this communication, including having elected officials and representatives of the public as members of the policy team, televising policy team meetings on local public access cable stations, presenting public education forums, and surveying public opinion on criminal justice topics.

Below are recommendations with regard to creating the capacity to implement change.

Recommendations For Creating the Capacity to Implement Change	
<i>Recommendation 33</i>	<u>Provide sites with tools and methods to help them follow through with and monitor changes and improvements.</u> The project should leave the sites with the capability to conduct their own data analysis and system assessments on a continuing basis, to provide feedback as to the successes of changes to the criminal justice system.
<i>Recommendation 34</i>	<u>Provide the sites with the tools to maintain a collaborative climate.</u> As new people take over leadership positions in the criminal justice system, there must be a method for integrating them into the collaborative methods of the Policy team.
<i>Recommendation 35</i>	<u>Communicate results to the community and stakeholders and build ongoing support for short and long term change and improvement efforts.</u> Help sites document the changes they have made to their criminal justice system and the resulting impacts to the community.

We believe that the above approach to information-based collaborative system-wide policy making will provide an effective method for jurisdictions seeking to rethink sanctioning policies and develop a more comprehensive criminal justice system policy.

ENDNOTES

¹ Kotter, J. P. (1990) *A Force For Change: How Leadership Differs from Management* (New York: Free Press).

² Chrislip, D. D. & Larson, C. E. (1994) *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens & Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

APPENDIX A

COLLABORATION SURVEY FINDINGS

BACKGROUND

We administered two surveys to address the issue of collaboration in each of the CJSP sites. The first survey was administered between May and October 1998 and the second between December 1999 and April 2000.

The two surveys were identical and contained 39 attitudinal statements that we grouped into eight broad categories of successful collaboration using a classification scheme developed by David Chrislip and Carol Larson. The eight categories are:

1. *Timing and need*: good timing, sense of immediate need
2. *Resources*: information, expertise and staff
3. *Composition of Team*: members representing a broad range of actors from the justice system and from the community as a whole
4. *Commitment*: strong commitment to the CJSP process
5. *Structure*: ground rules, work processes
6. *Collaborative work habits*: sharing information, monitoring effectiveness, listening to one another
7. *Setting goals*: setting and measuring progress in meeting goals; celebrating successes
8. *Working toward group goals*: placing group goals above the interests of the individual agencies represented on the Policy Team.

FINDINGS

The survey findings are presented in the attached tables for each of the eight categories listed above. Principal findings are:

- ✓ There are no statistically significant differences in the average ratings to any of the questions between the time of the first and second surveys. This reflects (1) the generally small size of the Policy Teams (e.g., St. Lawrence) and hence the small number of respondents to the surveys, (2) the low response rate from members of larger teams (e.g., Alaska) and (3) variability in the average ratings across project sites. That is, it is difficult to look at the data without considering the events that occurred at the individual sites.
- ✓ On a 10-point, true-false scale, an average rating of 5.50 suggests that respondents believed the statement was neither true nor false. All the statements had average scores above 5.50 when the ratings for all sites were combined; thus, all the statements were viewed a more true than false.

On a site-by-site basis, some statements received average ratings less than 5.50, indicating that respondents believed the statement was more false than true. For example, this was the case for Q23—We frequently discuss how we are working together—for three sites (St. Lawrence, Dutchess, and Wood/Portage). The respondents from Wood/Portage also rated as less true statements that they had adequate staff (Q6), had identified interim goals (Q35), and had an established method

for providing feedback (Q36). We believe that these ratings accurately reflect the sites' experiences and thus can be explained.

- ✓ The ratings to every statement were quite variable; even by CJSP site. That is, the ratings did not cluster around a few values, but were widely dispersed indicating considerable disagreement among Policy Team members about the truth of any single statement.
- ✓ The three statements that respondents felt were the *most* true about their Policy team in the second survey compared to the first survey are shown in the table below. There are no differences between the first and second survey in the statements that were rated the most true.

Most True Statements	1998 (rank) ¹	2000 (rank)
Q1: Now is a good time to address the criminal justice issues about which we are meeting.	9.30 (1)	9.19 (1)
Q2: The CJSP was started because certain individuals wanted to do something about the issues we are facing.	8.84 (2)	8.97 (2)
Q28: There are strong, recognized leaders who support this CJSP effort.	8.87 (3)	8.87 (3)

¹ Rank from most to least true of 39 statements asked in the survey.

- ✓ The three statements that respondents felt were the *least* true (or most false) about their Policy team in the second survey compared to the first survey are shown in the table below. There are no differences between the first and second survey in the statements that were rated the least true.

Least True Statements	1998 (rank) ¹	2000 (rank)
Q23: We frequently discuss how we are working together.	6.34 (36)	5.77 (39)
Q36: There is an established method for monitoring performance and providing feedback on goal attainment.	6.43 (38)	6.34 (38)
Q37: Our team is effective in obtaining the resources it needs to accomplish its objectives.	7.01 (29)	6.58 (37)

¹ Rank from most to least true of 39 statements asked in the survey.

- ✓ Based on the eight *categories* in our classification scheme, the category that was *most* true for all survey respondents was the Timing and Need for the project. Generally respondents across all sites agreed this was a good time address the issues they were meeting to address. There was less agreement that the situation was *critical* and that they therefore had to act now.

This was not the highest rated category for every individual CJSP site. Two sites (St. Lawrence and Alaska) had a higher average rating for the Composition of the Team and three sites (Jackson, Tulsa and Wood/Portage) had a higher average rating for the Commitment to the Process.

- ✓ Of the eight *categories* in the classification scheme, the category that was *least* true for all survey respondents was Setting Goals; that is, setting and monitoring goals and celebrating accomplishments. Although not as critical as some other categories in the initial stages of developing collaborative work processes, teams that move beyond the

initial stages need to set goals and measure their progress in meeting them. This category then, becomes more important over time.

For three CJSP sites, the average ratings for other categories were lower than for Setting Goals. The lowest rated category for Alaska was Composition of the Team, for St. Lawrence was Structure, and for Tulsa was Collaborative Work Habits.

- ✓ In the initial stages of developing collaborative work processes, the categories that are probably the most important are (1) Timing and Need, (2) Composition of the Team, (3) Structure, and (4) Working Toward Group Goals.

Least True Statements	1998 (rank)	2000 (rank)
Timing and Need	8.37 (1)	8.51 (1)
Composition of the Team	8.45 (2)	8.28 (2)
Commitment	8.23 (3)	8.15 (3)
Structure	7.52 (6)	7.78 (4)
Group Outcomes	7.61 (4)	7.59 (5)
Collaborative Work Habits	7.58 (5)	7.33 (6)
Resources	7.34 (7)	7.29 (7)
Setting Goals	6.78 (8)	7.03 (8)

- ✓ The average ratings across all 39 statements are shown below for each CJSP site.

CJSP Sites	1998 ¹	2000 ¹
Tulsa	8.83	8.33
Jackson County	7.34	8.10
Dutchess County	7.41	7.80
St. Lawrence County	7.99	7.63
Wood/Portage Counties	8.07	7.45
Alaska	6.97	7.11

¹ An average of the average for the 39 statements.

The 2000 average ratings for three of the sites are higher than the average ratings in the prior survey, while the averages for the other three sites are lower. We believe these differences are explainable from the sites' experiences between the first and second surveys.

- ✓ Key variables by all sites and by individual site.

TABLE A-1
TIMING AND NEED
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
1	9.30	9.19	9.14	8.88	9.35	9.47	9.44	9.50	9.82	9.40	9.58	9.63	8.71	8.44
2	8.84	8.97	9.00	9.38	8.82	9.67	9.22	8.36	9.27	9.40	9.36	8.75	7.94	8.44
3	6.96	7.38	7.57	7.13	6.50	7.94	6.78	7.67	7.27	7.40	6.83	7.00	7.19	6.72
Mean ³	8.37	8.51	8.57	8.46	8.22	9.19	8.48	8.51	8.79	8.73	8.59	8.46	7.95	7.86

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q1 Now is a good time to address the criminal justice issues about which we are meeting.

Q2 The Criminal Justice System Project was started because certain individuals wanted to do something about the issues we are facing.

Q3 The situation is so critical, we must act now.

TABLE A-2
RESOURCES FOR THE POLICY TEAM
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
4	7.55	7.34	9.00	7.88	7.89	8.12	7.00	8.33	8.64	8.00	7.83	6.63	5.91	5.78
5	8.36	8.31	8.86	8.63	8.44	8.82	7.38	8.75	9.36	8.70	8.42	6.25	7.82	8.06
6	6.42	6.93	7.29	6.86	5.69	6.44	4.50	7.75	8.82	8.20	7.64	5.38	5.25	6.83
37	7.01	6.58	8.50	7.25	7.07	7.50	5.88	7.00	8.09	7.40	7.75	6.67	5.77	4.83
Mean ³	7.34	7.29	8.41	7.66	7.27	7.71	6.19	7.96	8.73	8.08	7.91	6.23	6.19	6.38

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q4 Our team has access to credible information that supports problem solving and decision making.

Q5 Our team has access to the expertise necessary for effective meetings.

Q6 We have adequate staff assistance to plan and administer the CJSP effort.

Q37 Our team is effective in obtaining the resources it needs to accomplish its objectives.

TABLE A-3
COMPOSITION AND CAPABILITIES OF THE POLICY TEAM
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
7	8.48	8.44	9.43	9.14	8.28	8.53	8.00	8.08	9.09	9.10	8.68	8.38	8.00	8.00
8	8.42	8.01	8.29	8.38	8.00	7.59	8.67	7.83	9.09	8.70	8.75	7.50	8.12	7.83
17	8.72	8.71	8.57	8.63	8.11	8.12	8.89	9.20	9.82	9.20	8.92	8.75	8.47	8.67
18	8.30	8.03	8.17	8.13	8.06	7.94	8.38	8.89	9.10	7.78	8.50	7.88	7.94	7.78
19	8.32	8.19	8.43	8.75	8.12	8.00	8.38	8.40	9.00	8.40	8.46	8.00	7.94	7.89
Mean ³	8.45	8.28	8.58	8.61	8.11	8.15	8.46	8.48	9.22	8.64	8.66	8.10	8.09	8.03

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q7 Our team's membership includes those stakeholders affected by the issues.

Q8 Our team's membership is not dominated by any one organization or individual.

Q17 Policy Team members have the communication skills necessary to help the group progress.

Q18 Policy Team members balance task and social needs so that the group can work comfortably and productively.

Q19 Policy Team members are effective liaisons between their respective organizations and the group.

TABLE A-4
COMMITMENT TO THE PROCESS
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
9	8.90	8.68	9.00	9.13	8.44	8.24	9.44	8.75	9.46	9.40	9.17	9.00	8.50	8.06
20	7.21	7.16	7.83	6.75	6.83	6.94	7.57	8.10	8.09	7.50	7.92	8.17	6.13	6.56
25	7.80	7.91	7.14	7.13	8.17	8.88	8.14	8.30	9.27	9.30	8.73	8.14	6.00	6.33
28	8.87	8.87	8.14	8.63	9.13	9.44	9.11	9.30	9.46	9.40	8.75	9.00	8.50	7.89
31	8.36	8.13	8.57	8.25	7.88	7.65	8.38	8.60	9.18	9.30	8.83	8.14	7.88	7.56
Mean ³	8.23	8.15	8.14	7.98	8.09	8.28	8.53	8.61	9.09	8.98	8.68	8.49	7.40	7.28

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q9 Policy Team members have agreed to work together on the issues.

Q20 Policy Team members are willing to devote whatever effort is necessary to achieve the goals of the Criminal Justice System Project.

Q25 The process we are engaged in is likely to have a real impact on the issues we are addressing.

Q28 There are strong, recognized leaders who support this Criminal Justice System Project effort.

Q31 We have a strong concern for preserving a credible, open process.

TABLE A-5
CLEAR GROUND RULES, TEAM ROLES AND STRUCTURE
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
11	6.91	7.75	6.50	6.88	6.53	8.00	4.63	7.00	9.46	9.30	7.75	8.25	6.25	7.33
12	7.58	8.09	8.33	7.88	7.33	8.47	7.00	8.17	9.00	8.67	8.33	7.63	6.41	7.67
13	8.36	8.69	7.67	6.25	8.28	9.24	6.50	8.50	9.64	9.90	8.17	8.75	8.88	8.67
14	6.38	6.63	7.33	5.38	6.50	7.06	4.57	6.55	7.64	7.30	6.92	7.00	5.47	6.28
26	7.35	7.75	7.68	7.75	7.11	7.59	7.63	8.67	8.91	8.40	7.92	7.71	5.94	7.06
Mean ³	7.52	7.78	7.50	6.83	7.15	8.12	6.07	7.78	8.93	8.71	7.82	7.87	6.59	7.40

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q11 Our team has explicitly set ground rules and norms about how we will work together.

Q12 We have an effective method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all Policy Team members.

Q13 We organize into working sub-groups when necessary to attend to key priority areas.

Q14 There are clearly defined roles for Policy Team members.

Q26 We have an effective decision making process.

TABLE A-6
COLLABORATIVE WORK HABITS
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
16	8.04	7.82	8.50	8.38	7.44	7.47	8.25	9.11	8.91	8.60	8.42	6.86	7.56	7.11
21	7.03	6.88	7.50	7.00	6.82	7.00	6.25	6.11	8.70	8.40	7.83	6.71	5.88	6.35
22	8.06	7.91	8.67	8.75	7.69	7.50	8.89	8.90	8.91	8.40	8.25	7.75	7.06	7.11
23	6.34	5.77	5.71	5.25	5.89	5.41	6.71	6.44	6.82	6.20	6.83	5.00	6.25	5.94
24	8.39	8.22	8.17	8.38	8.00	8.06	8.71	8.70	8.73	8.20	8.42	7.75	8.53	8.22
27	7.87	7.43	7.83	7.50	7.82	7.60	8.13	8.09	8.73	7.70	8.33	7.14	6.94	6.83
38	7.36	7.28	8.83	7.38	6.82	7.69	7.00	7.70	8.67	7.40	7.64	7.33	6.63	6.56
Mean ³	7.58	7.33	7.89	7.52	7.21	7.26	7.71	7.86	8.50	7.84	7.96	6.93	6.98	6.87

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q16 Policy Team members are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit

Q21 Policy Team members monitor the effectiveness of the process.

Q22 Policy Team members trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions and feedback.

Q23 We frequently discuss how we are working together.

Q24 Divergent opinions are expressed and listened to.

Q27 The openness and credibility of the process help Policy Team members set aside doubts or skepticism.

Q38 Our team is willing to confront and resolve performance and other difficult issues.

TABLE A-7
SETTING AND MONITORING GOALS AND CELEBRATING ACCOMPLISHMENTS
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
32	7.68	7.96	7.14	7.63	7.18	8.12	7.50	8.10	9.00	8.30	8.58	8.43	7.00	7.44
33	6.68	6.95	7.00	6.63	6.20	6.29	5.57	7.70	8.55	7.60	7.08	5.80	5.87	7.06
34	6.25	6.65	7.68	6.75	5.56	6.63	4.71	7.30	8.92	7.90	6.58	5.67	5.12	5.83
35	6.88	7.26	7.83	7.25	5.88	7.53	4.71	7.80	8.82	8.80	7.25	5.33	6.88	6.56
36	6.43	6.34	7.00	6.25	5.71	6.27	4.43	6.89	8.82	7.40	6.82	5.33	5.94	5.94
Mean ³	6.78	7.03	7.33	6.90	6.11	7.02	5.38	7.56	8.82	8.00	7.26	6.11	6.16	6.57

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q32 We are inspired to be action oriented.

Q33 We celebrate our team's successes as we move toward achieving the final goals.

Q34 We have concrete, measurable goals to judge the success of our Criminal Justice System Project efforts.

Q35 We have identified interim goals to maintain the team's momentum.

Q36 There is an established method for monitoring performance and providing feedback on goal attainment.

TABLE A-8
ACCEPTANCE OF GROUP OUTCOMES AND COMMITMENT TO COMMON GOALS
(Average rating)¹

Question	All Sites ²		St. Lawrence (New York)		Dutchess (New York)		Jackson (Oregon)		Tulsa (Oklahoma)		Wood/Portage (Wisconsin)		Alaska	
	1998 (n=74)	2000 (n=73)	1998 (n=7)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=18)	2000 (n=17)	1998 (n=9)	2000 (n=12)	1998 (n=11)	2000 (n=10)	1998 (n=12)	2000 (n=8)	1998 (n=17)	2000 (n=18)
10	6.99	7.49	7.67	7.38	6.44	7.53	6.14	7.58	9.00	7.50	7.92	7.25	5.63	7.44
15	7.30	7.04	6.83	6.88	6.44	6.94	7.88	8.25	7.82	7.80	8.50	7.43	6.88	5.83
29	7.82	7.85	8.67	7.88	8.07	8.40	9.00	8.91	8.82	8.20	6.60	7.83	6.75	6.56
30	7.56	7.28	8.17	7.88	7.59	7.24	8.38	8.36	8.09	7.40	8.00	7.33	6.29	6.28
39	8.38	8.30	8.00	7.50	8.69	8.71	8.43	8.70	9.46	9.00	8.36	8.86	7.50	7.41
Mean ³	7.61	7.59	7.87	7.50	7.45	7.80	7.97	8.36	8.64	7.98	7.88	7.74	6.61	6.70

¹ The average rating is computed using a 10-point scale where 10=true and 1=false. Thus, the *higher* the average, the *more true* the statement was to respondents.

² Maricopa County, Arizona was no longer participating in the project at the time we administered the second collaboration survey.

³ The mean is a grand mean of all the statements we included in this category.

Q10 Policy Team members have agreed on what decisions will be made by the group.

Q15 Policy Team members are more interested in getting a good group decision than improving the positions of the organizations they represent.

Q29 those who are in positions of power or authority are willing to go along with the team's decisions or recommendations.

Q30 We set aside vested interests to achieve our common goals.

Q39 The time and efforts of the Policy Team are directed at obtaining the team's goals rather than keeping itself in business.

A PROFILE OF WORKING TOGETHER

Instructions

Site Code: 5

St. Lawrence County has been one of eight jurisdictions nationally participating in the Criminal Justice System Project (CJSP) sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections. As part of the CJSP research, we are studying the dynamics of the policy teams in all the sites. The Criminal Justice Policy Group ("Policy Group") is the policy team in St. Lawrence County.

The purpose of this survey is to elicit your opinions about how well the members of the Policy Group have worked together to address criminal justice system issues. Below are a number of statements. To the right of each statement is a 10-point scale for recording your response. Please read each statement, think about the extent to which it describes the Policy Group and circle the appropriate response. At the end of the survey there are a few background questions.

Your honest responses to all of the questions below will be extremely helpful in our research. Your responses are being used for statistical purposes only and will not be identified with you. **If you have any questions, please feel free to call Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey at 303-291-5117.**

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete and return the survey. **Please return the survey by Monday, March 6, 2000 to David A. Price, Policy Studies Inc., 999 18th Street, Suite 900; Denver, Colorado 80202. A stamped, return envelope is provided to send us your responses.**

I. A Profile of Working Together

In your opinion, how true or false is each of the following statements?
(Please circle one number for each statement. DK = don't know; NA = not applicable.)

	<u>True</u>										<u>False</u>	<u>DK/NA</u>
1. Now is a good time to address the criminal justice issue(s) about which we are meeting.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
2. The Criminal Justice System Project was started because certain individuals wanted to do something about the issue(s) we are facing.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
3. The situation is so critical, we must act now.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	

	<u>True</u>										<u>False</u>	<u>DK</u>
4. Our group has access to credible information that supports problem solving and decision making.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
5. Our group has access to the expertise necessary for effective meetings.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
6. We have adequate staff assistance to plan and administer the CJSP effort.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
7. Our group's membership includes those stakeholders affected by the issue(s).	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
8. Our group's membership is not dominated by any one organization or individual.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
9. Policy Group members have agreed to work together on the issue(s).	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
10. Policy Group members have agreed on what decisions will be made by the group.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
11. Our group has explicitly set ground rules and norms about how we will work together.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
12. We have an effective method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all Policy Group members.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
13. We organize into working sub-groups when necessary to attend to key priority areas.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
14. There are clearly defined roles for Policy Group members.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
15. Policy Group members are more interested in getting a good group decision than improving the positions of the organizations they represent.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	

	<u>True</u>										<u>False</u>	<u>DK/NA</u>
16. Policy Group members are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
17. Policy Group members have the communication skills necessary to help the group progress.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
18. Policy Group members balance task and social needs so that the group can work comfortably and productively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
19. Policy Group members are effective liaisons between their respective organizations and the group.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
20. Policy Group members are willing to devote whatever effort is necessary to achieve the goals of the Criminal Justice System Project.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
21. Policy Group members monitor the effectiveness of the process.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
22. Policy Group members trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions and feedback.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
23. We frequently discuss how we are working together.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
24. Divergent opinions are expressed and listened to.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
25. The process we are engaged in is likely to have a real impact on the issue(s) we are addressing.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
26. We have an effective decision making process.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	

	<u>True</u>										<u>False</u>	DK/ <u>NA</u>
27. The openness and credibility of the process help Policy Group members set aside doubts or skepticism.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
28. There are strong, recognized leaders who support this Criminal Justice System Project effort.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
29. Those who are in positions of power or authority are willing to go along with the group's decisions or recommendations.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
30. We set aside vested interests to achieve our common goal(s).	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
31. We have a strong concern for preserving a credible, open process.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
32. We are inspired to be action-oriented.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
33. We celebrate our group's successes as we move toward achieving the final goal(s).	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
34. We have concrete, measurable goals to judge the success of our Criminal Justice System Project efforts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
35. We have identified interim goals to maintain the group's momentum.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
36. There is an established method for monitoring performance and providing feedback on goal attainment.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
37. Our group is effective in obtaining the resources it needs to accomplish its objectives.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
38. Our group is willing to confront and resolve performance and other difficult issues.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	

	<u>True</u>										<u>False</u>	<u>DK/NA</u>
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	99	
39. The time and efforts of the Policy Group are directed at obtaining the group's goals rather than keeping itself in business.												
40. In your opinion, what <u>one</u> change would most improve the effectiveness of the Policy Group's ability to work together?												

II. Background Information

41. Agency Affiliation (please circle all that apply)

- 1 – Corrections (includes jails, probation, parole)
- 2 – Court/Judicial
- 3 – Defense
- 4 – Elected county officials
- 5 – Law Enforcement (police, sheriff)
- 6 – Prosecution
- 7 – Public Members
- 8 – Social Services/Service Providers
- 9 – Other (please specify)

42. Length of time in current position (Years) _____ or (Months)

43. Years of experience in the criminal justice system (Years) _____ or (Months)

44. Length of time living in the community (Years) _____ or (Months)

45. How frequently do you attend Policy Group meetings?

- 1 – Always
- 2 – Often
- 3 – Sometimes
- 4 – Never
- 9 – Don't know/can't recall

46. Were you a member of the Policy Group in May 1998?

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

APPENDIX B AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Steven Weller, J.D., Ph.D., a Senior Consultant at PSI, has over 25 years of experience working with courts and justice system agencies across the country and in Australia and Mongolia to help them respond to the changing demands of society. Weller has conducted extensive national scope research on a wide range of projects involving court organization and court processes, including work on small claims courts, methods for simplifying the trial court process, indigent defense and services, and alternative dispute resolution (ADR). He also has conducted research and published on developing a culturally appropriate ADR model for Latino parties and improving court handling of Latino family violence.

John A. Martin, Ph.D., is recognized as an innovator in planning and management for courts and justice organizations. Over the past 27 years he has conducted grant-funded research, provided long-term technical assistance and facilitated organizational development efforts in a variety of justice system settings, and taught seminars about trial and appellate court planning and management, pretrial release and diversion, drug case processing, simplified litigation, alternative dispute resolution, small claims courts, technology, Latino family violence, performance measurement, and legislative-judicial relations. Dr. Martin also serves on editorial boards and review panels for the National Institute of Justice of the United States Department of Justice, and is a Dean of the Executive Development Program of the Institute For Court Management. His writings about alternative dispute resolution, courts, police, corrections, planning, management, and public policy have been published in magazines, handbooks, scholarly books, and a variety of journals.

David A. Price, Ph.D. is co-founder and Sr. Vice President of PSI. Over the past 25 years, Price has directed and managed many projects ranging from single to multi-jurisdiction studies and involving data from multiple sources. Price is a skilled researcher with an extensive background in project design, implementation, and evaluation. He has developed data collection instruments of multiple types, including semi-structured interview guides; protocols for focus group discussions; structured telephone interview instruments; and data collection instruments for gathering information from primary and secondary sources.

Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey, Ph.D., is a skilled change agent, facilitator, planner, and researcher and has provided consulting, technical assistance, and evaluation services to public and private sector organizations and audiences of all types. Wagenknecht-Ivey's work has focused primarily on organizational development and organizational change broadly defined. She has provided consulting,

facilitation, and training services in such areas as long range strategic planning, organizational change, leadership and management development, team development and team building, collaborative decision making, consensus building, and continuous quality improvement.

APPENDIX C EVALUATION CONTACTS

National Institute of Corrections
Phyllis Modley
Correctional Program Specialist
Community Corrections Division
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Center for Effective Public Policy
Becki Ney
Senior Associate
Center for Effective Public Policy
32 East Montgomery Avenue
Hatboro, Pennsylvania 19040

Alaska (State of Alaska)
Margaret Pugh
Commissioner
Alaska Department of Corrections
240 Main Street, Suite 700
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Arizona (Maricopa County)
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
Deputy Court Administrator
Maricopa County Superior Court
201 West Jefferson St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

New York (Dutchess County)
Patricia Resch
Director
Office of Probation & Community
Corrections
50 Market Street
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

New York (St. Lawrence County)
Francine Perretta
Director
St. Lawrence County Probation
48 Court Street
Canton, New York 13617

Oklahoma (Tulsa County)
Hon. Jefferson Sellers
Presiding Judge
Tulsa County district Court
500 South Denver, 6th Floor
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

Oregon (Jackson County)
Robert Grindstaff
Director
Jackson County Community Corrections
Justice Building
100 South Oakdale
Medford, Oregon 97501

Wisconsin (Wood & Portage Counties)
Kathy King
Justice Planner
Portage County
408 McDonald Drive
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481